United Nations A/C.3/66/SR.44

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
15 February 2012

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 44th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 15 November 2011, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Haniff ..... (Malaysia)

Contents

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(c) Follow-up to the International Year of Older Persons: Second World Assembly on Ageing (*continued*)

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 64: Report of the Human Rights Council (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

11-59348 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(c) Follow-up to the International Year of Older Persons: Second World Assembly on Ageing (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.13/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.13/Rev.1: Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing

1. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.13/Add.1. The draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

2. **Mr. Cesa** (Argentina), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that since the introduction of the draft resolution, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Ukraine and the United States of America had joined the sponsors.

3. The open-ended working group on ageing established under General Assembly resolution 65/182 was not a permanent forum on the issue but would continue to function within its current mandate and existing resources until the end of that mandate, unless an explicit agreement was reached at a later stage by consensus. Its meetings would be held at times that would not conflict with those of other major meetings and only on the basis of available resources. Interpretation would be provided on an as available basis.

4. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Andorra, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Iceland, Monaco, Montenegro, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Serbia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Uzbekistan had become sponsors.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.19/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.19/Rev.1: Improvement of the situation of women in rural areas

6. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

7. **Ms. Ochir** (Mongolia), after briefly explaining the major revisions made to the draft resolution in informal consultations, said that since the introduction of the draft resolution, Argentina, Belize, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Greece, India, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey and the United States of America had joined the sponsors.

8. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia and Zimbabwe had become sponsors.

9. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.19/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 64: Report of the Human Rights Council (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.64/Rev.1, L.65 and L.66)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.65: United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training

10. **Mr. El Mkhantar** (Morocco), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.65 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft resolution, purely procedural in nature, marked the adoption by the Human Rights Council of resolution 16/1 on the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training. Announcing that Japan, Jordan, Monaco, Paraguay, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Spain and Uruguay had joined the sponsors, he thanked all countries who had sponsored the draft resolution for their support and invited those that had not yet done so to become sponsors. Since its 2007 launch, the initiative had received great support from Member States, non-governmental organizations and experts who had helped draft the declaration, which was now considered a key reference document.

11. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Malaysia, the Republic of Korea and the Republic of Moldova had become sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.64/Rev.1: Report of the Human Rights Council

12. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

13. **Ms. Maduhu** (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the Human Rights Council's constructive, cooperative approach, its avoidance of selectivity and double standards, and its provision of advice and support to Governments were making it possible to progressively overcome obstacles to consolidating universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The report of the Human Rights Council contained recommendations that were of the utmost importance to the Group, regarding, inter alia, trafficking in persons, combating contemporary forms of slavery and the right to development. In view of the fact that that some recommendations continued to be submitted to a vote despite their significance, and that others — of great significance to the Group and to developing countries — continued to be undermined, the draft resolution had been revised in a spirit of constructive engagement. Accordingly, the words "some of" in paragraph 1 had been deleted.

14. **Ms. Kolontai** (Belarus) said that her delegation could not accept politicized resolutions that resulted from the Human Rights Council's lack of objectivity in assessing human rights situations. It was unfortunate that the Council was making the same mistakes that had led to the demise of the discredited Commission on Human Rights. She decisively condemned the Council's politicized resolution on her country and pointed out that the lack of consensus among the members of the Council regarding the resolution showed that it did not reflect the opinion of the international community. Such politicization on the part of certain States devalued the role and function of the universal periodic review mechanism.

15. Moreover, the adoption of the resolution on Belarus undermined the institution-building package that the Council had established and that provided for the removal of the so-called Belarus question from the Council's agenda. In that connection, and taking into account the fact that the report of the Human Rights Council contained decisions that went against the bases of international cooperation and friendly relations among States enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, her delegation was forced to request that a recorded vote be taken on the draft resolution, which it would vote against.

16. **Mr. Adi** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that it was unfortunate that the report of the Human Rights Council (A/66/53) contained resolutions S-16/1 and S-17/1 on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic, as they were based on misleading media information and used language that was unprecedented in its hostility, sending a strong message of support for acts of terrorism and violence committed by armed terrorist groups.

17. Given the violations of human rights that such acts constituted, the Council's non-objective stance was mystifying. Interference in his country's internal affairs aimed at carrying out the political and military schemes of Western countries that were its enemies. Billions of dollars had been smuggled into the Syrian Arab Republic in recent months and distributed among extremists, arms smugglers and traders and armed terrorist groups supported by the United States of America and other countries, which his delegation would identify in due course in the context of their financing of terrorist activities.

18. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that he wished to remind the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic to act in accordance with the appropriate Committee decorum. His delegation strongly objected to the reference made to his country by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

19. **Mr. Adi** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that many criminals had confessed to killing demonstrators, planting explosives in crowded public places, burning and destroying public and private establishments, in addition to harassing citizens unwilling to partake of their crimes. Meanwhile, television stations in the employ of foreign powers continued to fabricate information and incite people without interruption. The High Commissioner for Human Rights had refused to mention those realities in her report, despite the fact that his country had provided information on the events and on measures that it was taking to address them. For

those reasons, his delegation would vote against the resolution.

20. That decision, however, did not change his country's firm, principled position on the recommendations contained in the Council's report on human rights violations committed by Israel in the occupied Syrian Golan and Palestine, an issue that merited the support of all Member States. His delegation also reiterated its principled position against interference by any country in the internal affairs of any other, using the defence of human rights as a pretext, and categorically rejected the Council's country-specific resolutions on the Islamic Republic of Iran, Belarus, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Myanmar.

21. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that, while his delegation supported the draft resolution, it was concerned about a number of decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council, a body initially established to pursue constructive dialogue and cooperation on human rights issues. Noting the disturbing trend towards divisiveness in its work in recent years, he pointed out that his delegation did not support the Human Rights Council's resolutions on human rights situations in Belarus, the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Syrian Arab Republic or on so-called sexual-orientation issues.

22. **Mr. Herczyński** (Poland), speaking in explanation of vote before voting on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, Iceland, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Liechtenstein, Norway, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union's concerns were largely procedural. Since countries could follow up on recommendations made by the Human Rights Council individually, it was not necessary to note Council resolutions in a generic manner.

23. By asking the Committee to take note of the Council's report in its entirety, the draft resolution ignored the existing arrangement agreed to, whereby the Committee would only consider and, when necessary, take action on individual recommendations. Expressing disappointment that the draft resolution continued to disregard that understanding and noting the questions that many Member States still had about the initiative taken by the Group of African States, he regretted that it had not been possible to discuss procedural and other aspects of the text in an open meeting. For that reason, the member States of the European Union would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as orally revised.

24. *At the request of the representative of Belarus, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.64/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Fiji, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen.

Against:

Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan,

Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

25. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.64/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 95 votes to 4, with 60 abstentions.**

26. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote as it did not see the benefit of the draft resolution. While the United States remained concerned about the Council's disproportionate focus on Israel, the Council's ability to serve as a multilateral forum for promoting and protecting human rights had notably improved in the past year, as evident, inter alia, through its historic resolution 17/19 on human rights, sexual orientation and gender identity, resolution 16/18 promoting religious tolerance, and the establishment of commissions of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

27. **Mr. Mohammad Pour Ferami** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because the report of the Human Rights Council included resolutions and recommendations that were of grave concern and mainly pursued politicized objectives extending well beyond human rights causes. The adoption of country-specific resolutions, including the one on his country, was futile and reflected the same double standards that had led to the demise of the Commission on Human Rights.

28. **Ms. Burgess** (Canada) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote because follow-up on the Council's report should take place in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly, not in the Third Committee. The latter approach gave the false impression that the Council was subordinate to the Committee. In addition, Canada was concerned about the recommendations regarding the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict, which unfairly singled out one party, underscoring the Council's disproportionate focus on Israel.

29. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her country had voted in favour of the draft resolution in the light of the importance that it attached to most of the topics contained in the report. Nevertheless, it did not support the Council's resolutions which entailed selective initiatives against developing countries, especially those clearly based on political motivations, such as the resolutions on Belarus, the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Syrian Arab Republic. Her country supported the impartial, objective and constructive work of the Council, but would oppose any attempt to adopt such selective, country-specific resolutions, since that approach had led to the failure of the Commission on Human Rights.

30. **Mr. Tagle** (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, as his Government supported the actions and decisions of the Council, which had always abided by the principle of non-selectivity, and appreciated the independence of the human rights mechanisms and special procedures. Nevertheless, it had doubts regarding procedure, since the Council's report should have been voted on in the plenary of the General Assembly. It was hoped that the following year's draft resolution on the report would be open to consultations involving the entire membership.

31. **Ms. Furman** (Israel) said that the Council's report provided a comprehensive picture of its work, and Israel welcomed some of the Council's actions, in particular resolution 17/19 on human rights, sexual orientation and gender identity, its special sessions on the human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic and the appointment of a special rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran under resolution 16/9. Nevertheless, the report and the resolutions that it contained against Israel reflected the Council's continued bias against it. Agenda item 7 of the Human Rights Council and the resolutions adopted under it undermined the Council's integrity and credibility, and it was regrettable that the Council's recent review had not corrected that fundamental flaw. That systematic institutional discrimination tainted the Council's ability to promote and protect human rights in the world. Her country had thus abstained in the vote.

* The delegations of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Iraq subsequently informed the Committee that they had intended to abstain.

32. **Mr. Butt** (Pakistan) said that his country had voted in favour of the draft resolution, despite disagreement on some issues, in the light of the Council's efforts to reach an understanding on various issues of mutual interest and the consensus reached on controversial issues, including on combating intolerance based on religion or belief. Nevertheless, it was a matter of concern that some Council resolutions, such as that on sexual orientation and gender identity, were not in line with human rights standards or laws. Also of concern was the adoption of selective and politicized country-specific resolutions. Pakistan looked forward to strengthening the work of the Council in addressing the human rights of all persons in all countries in a non-selective and impartial manner in the future.

33. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that her country had voted in favour of the draft resolution, as in previous years. Nevertheless, Cuba was concerned about the negative trend of political manipulation and double standards in the consideration of human rights issues in the Committee and the Council, especially the latter's selective and discriminatory criticism of developing countries while overlooking the situations in developed countries, an approach which was reminiscent of that of the Commission on Human Rights.

34. **Ms. Medal** (Nicaragua) said that her country had voted in favour of the draft resolution, recognizing the Council as a legitimate body for the equitable consideration of human rights issues and the universal periodic review as an effective tool for assessing human rights situations in different countries. Nevertheless, Nicaragua rejected the adoption of country-specific resolutions, which led to politicization, selectivity and double standards.

35. **Ms. Li** Xiaomei (China) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it fully supported the Council's work that was conducted in a mutually respectful and equitable manner. Nevertheless, it was against country-specific human rights resolutions or the pressuring or singling out of countries in the name of human rights.

36. **Mr. Vigny** (Switzerland), speaking also on behalf of Norway, said that, while both countries strongly supported the Council's work, they had abstained in the vote for procedural reasons, as the consideration of the Council's report fell under the purview of the General Assembly, not the Committee.

37. **Ms. Murillo** (Costa Rica) said that her country fully supported the work of the Council and its resolutions and recommendations and had in the past supported texts similar to the draft resolutions in the report. Nevertheless, Costa Rica was concerned about the motives for which the recorded vote had been requested. It welcomed the oral revision made by the African Group, but had abstained in the vote because the Council was the highest authority for addressing human rights and its report should be submitted for consideration by the plenary General Assembly, not the Committee.

38. **Mr. Frick** (Liechtenstein) said that his country was an active and strong supporter of the work of the Human Rights Council and welcomed the recommendations that the Council had transmitted to the General Assembly for further action, particularly on the third Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training. As agreed during the review of the Council, there was no need for the Committee to note the Council's recommendations. Should the Committee decide not to follow a recommendation, it could do so by not acting on it. Also, it was regrettable that the draft resolution disregarded the understanding that had been reached on the division of work between the Committee and the plenary General Assembly in dealing with the Council's report. It was for the General Assembly, not the Committee, to take action on the report.

39. **Mr. Jang** Il Hun (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his country had voted against the draft resolution, not because it took issue with the Council's report as a whole, but because the country-specific draft resolutions that it contained, including the one on his country, ran counter to the principles of objectivity and non-selectivity that should govern the consideration of human rights issues and the universal periodic review. His Government would continue to oppose all such resolutions because they reflected politicization, selectivity and double standards.

40. **Mr. Ruiz** (Colombia) said that, although his delegation strongly supported the Council's work, like others, it was concerned about the procedural issue of the Council's report being submitted for consideration by the Committee. It had thus abstained in the vote.

41. **Ms. Alp** (Turkey) said that her country had voted in favour of the draft resolution in the belief that the recommendations of the Council must be noted in a non-selective manner. Follow-up to the report of the independent international fact-finding mission on the incident of the humanitarian flotilla under resolutions 16/20 and 17/10 must be diligently pursued.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.66: Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure

42. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) read out a statement, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, on the programme budget implications of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution. It was anticipated that, based on the assumption that the Optional Protocol would enter into force in late 2013 or early 2014, no programme budget implications would arise for the biennium 2012-2013. It was also estimated that the additional requirements of $2.190 million, including $1.582 million, under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management; $580,100 under section 24, Human Rights; and $28,000 under section 29 E, Administration, Geneva, would arise for the biennium 2014-2015 and would be taken into consideration in the context of preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

43. Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, it was anticipated that no additional resources would be required either under the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011 or under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. He recalled that, during the introduction of the draft resolution, the main sponsor had orally revised the wording of the preambular paragraph. Lastly, he said that Bangladesh, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Japan, Kazakhstan, Mali, Morocco, Poland, Turkey and the United States of America had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

44. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.66, as orally revised, was adopted.*

45. **Mr. Faizal** (Maldives), speaking also on behalf of Austria, Chile, Germany, Slovakia, Slovenia, Thailand and Uruguay, said that, while those main sponsors would have preferred maintaining the wording of the draft resolution as recommended by the Human Rights Council, they welcomed the spirit of compromise that had prevailed during negotiations and its adoption by consensus. He encouraged all States to consider signing and ratifying the Optional Protocol as soon as possible once it would be open for signature in 2012.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (A/C.3/66/L.29/Rev.1 and L.58)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.33, L.36, L.40, L.41, L.46, L.47/Rev.1, L.48/Rev.1, L.52/Rev.1 and L.53/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.29/Rev.1: Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol thereto

46. **The Chair** drew the Committee's attention to the statement of the programme budget implications of the draft resolution in document A/C.3/66/L.58.

47. **Mr. Gomez** (Sweden), speaking also on behalf of Mexico and New Zealand, introduced draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.29/Rev.1. Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Estonia, the Federated States of Micronesia, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, the Sudan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Vanuatu had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. Lastly, he underscored the rapid rate of ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, a trend which would likely continue, and hoped that States would be committed to its implementation.

48. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belize, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Mali, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, the Republic of Moldova, the

Russian Federation, San Marino, South Africa, Suriname, Swaziland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United States of America and Uruguay had also joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

49. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.29/Rev.1 was adopted.*

50. **Mr. Kimura** (Japan) said that his country had joined the consensus to adopt the draft resolution in the light of the urgent need to tackle the backlog faced by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the need to take into consideration the issue of reasonable accommodation. It must nevertheless be borne in mind that the programme budget implications of the decision to extend the Committee's working schedule would be absorbed by the regular budget of the United Nations, which was not unlimited, especially in the context of the difficult economic times. That Committee must continue to enhance its working methods and effectiveness.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.33: Promotion of equitable geographical distribution in the membership of the human rights treaty bodies

51. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

52. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, said that China had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

53. **Mr. Herczyński** (Poland), speaking in explanation of vote before voting on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, Iceland, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Liechtenstein, Norway, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that while the European Union fully recognized the importance of the principle of equitable geographical distribution in the composition of human rights treaty bodies, it opposed the draft resolution on several grounds. Human rights treaties already contained provisions that prescribed the composition of treaty bodies through elections of State party nationals. Though some treaties did explicitly state that consideration would be given to geographical distribution and the representation of different legal systems, it was not up to the General Assembly to modify the provisions on the composition of treaty bodies, nor should it seek to induce States parties to do so.

54. The draft resolution was particularly prescriptive in its proposal of a quota system and its inappropriate request for chairs of treaty bodies to make recommendations on equitable geographic distribution, both of which the European Union strongly objected to. Such matters, if considered at all, should be discussed by the States parties concerned. It was regrettable that the delegation of Cuba had not incorporated more constructive suggestions on how to achieve a better balance in treaty bodies without resorting to quotas. The member States of the European Union would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

55. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.33.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu,

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Chile, Nigeria.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.33 was adopted by 119 votes to 52, with 2 abstentions.*

57. **Mr. Argüello** (Argentina) said that his Government supported the principle of equitable geographical distribution in contexts where it was in conformity with applicable international law. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that its recommendations must be interpreted in accordance with international law, without prejudice to the full independence of human rights treaty bodies, which functioned according to the conventions under which they had been established. Each convention established the obligations of States parties and the principles governing the selection of treaty body experts.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.36: Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

58. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

59. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that the Non-Aligned Movement had expressed on various occasions its opposition to the use of unilateral coercive measures as tools for exerting political pressure against any country, especially developing countries, which must not be deprived of the means of development. Since the introduction of the draft resolution, China had become a sponsor. The current version of the draft resolution, which was introduced on an annual basis, contained technical updates and new references to ageing persons and persons with disabilities.

60. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before voting, said that his delegation had called for a vote because it believed that the draft resolution had no basis in international law and did not serve the cause of promoting and protecting human rights, a responsibility that fell to States. The text of the draft resolution was a direct challenge to the right of sovereign States to freely conduct their economic relations and protect legitimate national interests, including taking actions in response to national security concerns. It also attempted to undermine the international community's ability to respond to acts that were offensive to international norms. Unilateral and multilateral sanctions were a legitimate means to achieve foreign policy, security and other legitimate national and international objectives, a view that his country was not alone in holding or putting into practice.

61. *At the request of the delegation of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.36.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda,

Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Democratic Republic of the Congo.

62. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.36 was adopted by 121 votes to 52, with 1 abstention.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.40: International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

63. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

64. **Mr. Argüello** (Argentina), speaking also on behalf of France and Morocco, said that since the introduction of the draft resolution, Belize, Cameroon, the Comoros, Grenada, Honduras, India, Mali, Senegal, Serbia, Tunisia and Ukraine had joined the sponsors. Five years after its adoption by the General Assembly, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance had entered into force in December 2010 and currently had 90 signatures and 30 ratifications. The Convention was the first universal, legally binding instrument to recognize that enforced disappearance could constitute a crime against humanity and to reaffirm the right of victims to reparation, justice and truth.

65. Efforts must be made to achieve the universal ratification and implementation of the Convention, as it would be naive to imagine that history would not repeat itself. Enforced disappearance, secret detentions and extrajudicial executions on State orders continued to occur, and few of those responsible were brought to justice over them. His own country's recent tragic history attested to that fact.

66. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Nicaragua, the Niger and Nigeria had joined the sponsors.

67. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.40 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.41: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

68. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

69. **Mr. Selim** (Egypt) said that, since the introduction of the draft resolution, over 91 Member States had joined the sponsors, proving that the international community acknowledged the challenges and opportunities that globalization presented. The unequal distribution of its benefits and the impact of its challenges were unfavourable for developing countries and in turn affected their ability to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms. It was unfortunate that certain delegations had refused to engage in a constructive dialogue to resolve their fundamental problems with the concept set forth in the text, despite the sponsors' willingness to do so.

70. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Antigua and Barbuda, Jamaica and Saint Kitts and Nevis had become sponsors.

71. **Mr. Herczyński** (Poland), speaking in explanation of vote before voting on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, Iceland, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Liechtenstein, Norway, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union could not support the draft resolution, which, regrettably, remained the same as the previous

year's draft. Dealing with the effects of globalization — a multidimensional phenomenon — was high on the agenda of the European Union. While the challenges faced in the world were increasingly of a global nature, globalization could also offer means to tackle some of the most acute problems as well as great opportunities for stimulating growth and prosperity worldwide, thus contributing to the promotion and protection of human rights.

72. The European Union acknowledged that globalization could have an impact on the full enjoyment of human rights; however, the draft resolution inaccurately stated that globalization adversely affected the full enjoyment of all human rights, a generalization that the European Union could not subscribe to. The relationship between human rights and globalization — which in certain instances could be a positive one — must be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

73. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.41.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

74. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.41 was adopted by 125 votes to 52.*

75. **Mr. Tagle** (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that globalization presented both benefits, which his country, with its open economy, had certainly reaped, and challenges, which must be addressed in solidarity by all Member States.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.46: Effective promotion of the Declaration of the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities

76. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

77. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Panama had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

78. **Ms. Ploder** (Austria) said that, since the introduction of the draft resolution, Brazil, Greece, Haiti, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, the Niger and San Marino had joined the sponsors. She read out

revisions to the text. In the third preambular paragraph, the words "involving them" had been replaced by the phrase "involving the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities". Paragraph 4 had been reworded to read "*Calls upon* States to give special attention to the situation and specific needs of women and children belonging to minorities, while promoting and protecting the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities". Paragraph 15 had been deleted. In paragraph 21, the words "together with" had been replaced with "as well as", the word "further" had been inserted before "encourages States" and the word "parties" had been inserted after "States". The last phrase of that paragraph thus read "and further encourages States parties to give serious consideration to the follow-up to treaty body recommendations on the matter;".

79. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Latvia, the Russian Federation and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

80. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.46, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.47/Rev.1: Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization, discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons, based on religion or belief

81. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

82. **Mr. Al-Yafei** (United Arab Emirates), speaking on behalf of the member States of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), said that Australia, Brazil, Senegal and Thailand had joined the sponsors.

83. **Mr. Herczyński** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, Iceland, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia, Azergaijan, Georgia, Liechtenstein, Norway, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that ongoing dialogue about the important issues of tolerance, non-discrimination, freedom of expression and of thought, conscience and religion or belief was the only way to overcome existing divergences and misperceptions. The European Union welcomed the positive atmosphere in which those issues had been discussed.

84. He noted, however, that, rather than refer to religious and cultural diversity specifically, the draft resolution should use the more inclusive concept of diversity in general, since individuals had multiple sources of identity. To effectively combat intolerance, all aspects of diversity must be taken into account, and, as in the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, no one might invoke cultural diversity to infringe upon human rights guaranteed by international law, nor limit their scope. The European Union understood that religious hatred was primarily a threat to individual freedoms at the local and national levels. Viewing the world as composed of monolithic cultural and religious blocks was of concern as that could divert attention away from the responsibility of national and local authorities to safeguard individual rights, especially those of minority communities or groups.

85. The European Union condemned attacks on religious sites, but emphasized that the Committee should focus on individuals and the protection of their rights and noted that all States must fulfil their obligations under existing international human rights treaties to protect individuals against discrimination and violence on the basis of their religion or belief. In particular, all persons belonging to religious communities and minorities should be able to practise their religion and worship freely without fear of intolerance or attacks. Also, the draft resolution under consideration explicitly mentioned the establishment of one centre for interreligious and intercultural dialogue, whereas there were numerous such centres around the world and all comparable initiatives should be acknowledged. Despite those issues, European Union members, in a spirit of cooperation, were in a position to join consensus.

86. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that his country was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, which it hoped would be a blueprint for further action. For some years, his country had shared the stated concerns of the sponsors and others about intolerance, discrimination and violence directed against persons on the basis of their religion and belief. It was a serious concern that such problems persisted in the world.

87. In the past, the United States had not been able to support the sponsors' efforts to address those problems because of their excessive reliance on seeking to restrict expression as a means to combat intolerance, discrimination and violence based on religion or belief. That was counterproductive and exacerbated the very problems that the draft resolutions sought to address. In various parts of the world, laws that criminalized offensive expression had been misused by Governments to persecute political opponents and minorities. In some cases, those who had engaged in violence or murder on grounds of religion had pointed to such laws as justification for their actions.

88. However, in line with Human Rights Council resolution 16/18, the draft resolution provided for the criminalization of expression in only one circumstance: incitement to imminent violence. The draft resolution recognized that the only solution to offensive expression was more expression, not laws that restricted expression in the name of tolerance. His country welcomed any initiative that upheld respect for universal human rights and recommended measures such as education or awareness-building to promote interfaith harmony in combating discrimination against individuals on the basis of religion or belief.

89. Such initiatives could promote respect for religious diversity in a manner that respected universal human rights. Each Member State must endeavour to implement the recommendations in the draft resolution, and all Governments must take assertive measures to uphold international obligations and promote awareness and understanding of the issues that it addressed. Member States must provide updates on their efforts to that end as part of ongoing reporting to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

90. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted.*

91. **Mr. Quinlan** (Australia) said that the draft resolution was important to Australia, which was vastly diverse and where any violence on the basis of religion, ethnicity or cultural belief was a direct threat to the health of its society as a whole. His Government was endeavouring to ensure that all persons could celebrate and practise their religion or belief free from discrimination, including through its multicultural and multilingual public broadcasting service, as the media could play an important role in helping to promote and celebrate the multicultural nature of society. It had also recently launched a new multicultural policy, involving community-led strategies to encourage tolerance. Australia had participated in interfaith dialogue and was negotiating a practical joint programme with the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, which it commended for its historic achievement.

92. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her country wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.48/Rev.1: Elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief

93. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

94. **Mr. Herczyński** (Poland) said that Costa Rica, New Zealand, Thailand and Ukraine had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

95. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Benin, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, the Philippines, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

96. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.48/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.52/Rev.1: Protection of migrants

97. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

98. **Ms. Dias** (Mexico) said that Bangladesh, Belize, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Indonesia and Portugal had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

99. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Senegal, Tunisia and Turkey had also joined the sponsors.

100. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.52/Rev.1 was adopted.*

101. **Mr. Herczyński** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Union had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and remained firmly committed to protecting migrants' rights by taking a

balanced approach and applying the rule of law. The human rights of migrant children, particularly those who were unaccompanied, was paramount.

102. The European Union respected and upheld the human rights of migrants regardless of their status, and while some migrants were not automatically granted the right to reside in European Union member States, their rights were respected.

103. It was a priority of the Union to combat certain migration flows, especially those of human trafficking networks, and a number of its member States had introduced criminal penalties in that regard. Drawing attention to the concern referred to in paragraph 3 (b) about legislative measures and practices that might restrict the human rights and fundamental freedoms of migrants, he noted that the application of criminal sanctions for those migrants who breached national criminal law did not affect their rights to a fair trial.

104. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. The principle in international law that all States had the sovereign right to control admission to their territory and regulate the admission and expulsion of foreign nationals was implicit in any discussion of migration. At the same time, States must respect the human rights of migrants consistent with their obligations under international law, including international human rights law. His Government took that responsibility seriously and provided substantial protections under its Constitution and other laws to aliens within its territory regardless of their immigration status. In addressing migration on a global scale, it was inappropriate to refer to a bilateral legal matter in the draft resolution, such as in the ninth preambular paragraph, as that diverted attention from the multilateral reflection and action required and did not help to advance the protection of the human rights of migrants.

105. His country had a long history of welcoming immigrants and refugees and valued legal, orderly and humane migration. It urged all its citizens to respect the relevant local and national laws when living or working in another country. His country welcomed legal immigrants and properly-documented temporary visitors, including workers and students and was committed to protecting the human rights of migrants within its borders as well as to ending racism and racial discrimination, upholding the human rights of all people and combating xenophobia, intolerance and bigotry. Lastly, paragraph 3(a) should not be misinterpreted to inhibit freedom of expression or to express policy views or even hateful attitudes or philosophies, but must be interpreted in the light of robust international legal protections for freedom of expression.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.53/Rev.1: Follow-up to the International Year of Human Rights Learning

106. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

107. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Brazil, the Republic of Korea and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines had joined the sponsors.

108. **Mr. Babadoudou** (Benin), speaking on behalf of the African Group and other sponsors, said that Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand and Turkey had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

109. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mali, Mexico, Montenegro, Nicaragua, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Switzerland and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

110. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.53/Rev.1 was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

United Nations A/C.3/66/SR.45

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
7 February 2012

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 45th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 17 November 2011, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Hanif ..... (Malaysia)

Contents

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

Agenda item 64: Report of the Human Rights Council (*continued*)

Agenda item 67: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 107: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

11-59354 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.6/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.6/Rev.1: Tenth anniversary of the International Year of Volunteers

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Kodama** (Japan), speaking also on behalf of Brazil, announced editorial corrections to the draft resolution and said that Belgium, Greece, Italy, Malaysia, Mexico, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa and Thailand had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

3. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Andorra, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Georgia, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Lithuania, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Niger, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Senegal, South Africa, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu and Yemen had also joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.6/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Agenda item 64: Report of the Human Rights Council (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.65)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.65: United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training

5. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

6. **Mr. Zelioli** (Italy), speaking on behalf of the Platform for Human Rights Education and Training, which also included Costa Rica, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia and Switzerland, said that Burundi, the Congo, France, Iceland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Nicaragua and Thailand had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

7. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Estonia, Georgia, Guinea Bissau, India, Latvia, Mali, the Niger, Nigeria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay had also joined the sponsors.

8. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.65 was adopted.*

9. **Ms. Freedman** (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that, while her Government acknowledged the importance of human rights education and training for citizens, which it would continue to promote in the future, there was no basis in international law for presenting such education and training as a human right and the adoption of the draft resolution would not change her country's legal position.

10. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that human rights education and training was critical in the promotion of all human rights and fundamental freedoms, and welcomed the fact that the draft resolution helped to strengthen support and respect for human rights educators and trainers at all levels.

11. On the matter of whether there existed under international law a right to human rights education and training, his Government had limited authority over education at the national level, and thus could not accept additional obligations that such a right would imply. That did not affect his country's commitment to promoting individuals' ability to know their human rights. While the United States strongly believed that education could contribute to combating discrimination and intolerance, its participation in the consensus on the draft resolution did not mean that human rights education could be used to promote the suppression of the right of freedom of expression in any way.

12. The reference in the Declaration to a right to know, seek and receive information about all human rights and fundamental freedoms was no more extensive than the right to seek, receive and impart information under article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Moreover, because the United States was not a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, it was not reaffirming obligations under that instrument.

Nevertheless, his Government believed that the Declaration would be a valuable building block in the foundation of human rights instruments promoting knowledge of and respect for all human rights.

13. **Ms. Burgess** (Canada) said that the Government of Canada was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution. Although Canada did not recognize the existence of a right to human rights education and training, it considered such education and training as an important aspect of the rights to education, to seek, receive and impart information and to freedom of opinion and expression and believed that it could best be supported through a wide range of policies and programmes adopted at the appropriate level of Government. States should be free to determine how best to promote human rights education and training within their jurisdictions.

14. **The Chair** suggested that the Committee should take note, in accordance with the annex to General Assembly decision 55/488, of the report of the Secretary-General on the observance of the International Day for the Right to the Truth concerning Gross Human Rights Violations and for the Dignity of Victims (A/66/335).

15. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 67: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.60)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.60: Inadmissibility of certain practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

16. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

17. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Côte d'Ivoire, Mauritania, the Niger, Seychelles and Uzbekistan had joined the sponsors.

18. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) noted that the draft resolution enjoyed the broad support of sponsors from all over the world. In addition to those previously cited, new sponsors included Cape Verde, Iran, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Syria and Lebanon.

19. Millions of innocent lives had been lost in the Second World War, including those who had fallen victim to theories of racial and ethnic supremacy. Those events had constituted war crimes and crimes against humanity, as determined by the Nuremberg Tribunal, and to refute them now would be tantamount to rewriting history.

20. However, an attempt was once again being made to do so, with certain Governments expressing a readiness to have draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.60 put to a vote. Apart from its clear human rights significance, the resolution paid due tribute to the memory of those who gave their lives so that the gathered delegates could freely assemble. Those who wished to put the draft resolution to a vote were invoking the difficulties inherent in defining who had fought against the anti-Hitler coalition, even going so far as to declare that the issue of victory in the Second World War had no bearing on the subject of human rights. Yet the human rights provisions in the United Nations Charter had been written in direct response to the horrors of the Second World War and to the heinous crimes of the Nazi regime.

21. Increasingly, monuments to the Nazis were being unveiled, anniversaries of emancipation from Nazi rule were being declared days of mourning and persons opposed to forgetting those who had struggled against Nazism were being arrested. In certain countries, those who had fought against the anti-Hitler coalition were being presented as heroes and as champions of national self-determination. That phenomenon was an example not of political correctness, but of blatant cynicism and blasphemy with respect to those who had freed the world from the horrors of National Socialism. It involved criminally punishable acts, as stipulated in article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

22. Certain delegations had for several years been attempting to intimate that racism and the spread of racist ideas could not be fought by prohibitions and criminal prosecutions. They argued that, if a society was healthy and democratic, it would naturally reject racism as alien and incompatible with its democratic principles. Yet according to a recent report by the Anti-Defamation League, more than 15 per cent of the citizens of one of the world's most democratic countries were openly anti-Semitic. In certain segments of the population, that figure rose to over 30 per cent, and Nazi swastikas continued to appear on synagogues

in that country on the anniversary of the sadly notorious Kristallnacht.

23. The sponsors of the draft resolution considered it entirely unacceptable that those involved in the crimes of Nazism should be glorified or that they should have their culpability minimized, as had occurred in the case of some former members of the SS, declared by the Nuremberg Tribunal to be a criminal organization. Such revisionist manifestations of contemporary racism, discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance were cause for profound alarm. The sponsors had sought to fashion a text that would be balanced and acceptable to delegations. Open consultations had been held and a number of bilateral meetings convened, as a result of which many additions and amendments had been included. Conversely, there had been proposals and commentaries which were fundamentally unacceptable, including the notions that the issue of victory in the Second World War was in no way related to universal human rights standards and that the contemporary glorification of Nazism was merely an example of freedom of expression and association. Twenty or 30 years earlier, when a majority of the veterans of the Second World War had still been alive, no one would have dared to voice similar arguments at the United Nations. He wished to know why it had suddenly become acceptable.

24. Adoption of the draft resolution with the broadest possible support of Member States would contribute enormously to efforts aimed at eliminating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance. Its adoption was a duty not only towards those who had founded the United Nations, but also towards the future generations they had sought to forever free from the horrors of war.

25. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors.

26. **Ms. Velichko** (Belarus), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance continued to be a problem in the modern world, and concerns about fascism and extremist movements were reflected in the Interim report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (A/65/295). Lessons could be learned from the verdict of the Nuremburg Tribunal and Nazism and racial supremacy must be eradicated once and for all. It was unacceptable to consider the use of swastikas and other Nazi symbols as part of freedom of expression and opinion. Fascist ideology was the basis for aggression and hostility. The draft resolution had the practical value of helping to foster awareness among young people of the difference between right and wrong, and their ability to learn from history. Her delegation would thus vote in favour of the draft resolution.

27. **Ms. Grabianowska** (Poland), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, Iceland, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Liechtenstein, Norway, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union remained convinced that the fight against all manifestations of racism and xenophobia, including neo-Nazism, must be a priority for all Member States. Given the international community's responsibility towards victims of racism, past and present, it was imperative to avoid divisive concepts or rhetorical and selective approaches that would dilute the significance of the issues addressed in the draft resolution or divert resources from addressing them. The European Union therefore regretted the lack of a more comprehensive, inclusive dialogue with the wider membership of the United Nations on the proposals submitted by different delegations concerning the text of the draft resolution. The text before the Committee had continued to deteriorate, especially with regard to such essential issues for the European Union as freedom of expression, the role of civil society and the independence of the Special Rapporteur.

28. A more objective and legally appropriate approach with a clear focus on the human rights perspective could provide added value to the global fight against racism. Measures to combat manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, while necessary, must be in line with the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and must not undermine human rights and fundamental freedoms as defined by international human rights law. The text should avoid any language that could imply unfounded restrictions on freedom of expression.

29. The main sponsors should rectify the inaccurate citations from the judgement issued by the Nuremberg Tribunal, as the draft resolution in its current form implied a principle of common responsibility that the European Union could not accept. The issue of monuments and memorials, on which the draft resolution placed particular emphasis, was an internal matter for States and not relevant to the human rights agenda. The reference in operative paragraph 9 to the need for "increased political and legal vigilance" in order to prevent the spread of extremist movements left room for inappropriate interpretations, raising serious concerns regarding the independence of the judiciary or freedom of assembly and association. Similarly, education should cover a multitude of racist and totalitarian ideologies throughout history in order to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the complexities of racism. The draft resolution's request to the Special Rapporteur to focus on aspects of those phenomena specified therein ran counter to the principle of respecting the independence of the mandate-holder. Lastly, the new language in operative paragraph 26 introduced a biased assumption on civil-society activity to combat racism.

30. For those reasons, the Member States of the European Union would not support the draft resolution.

31. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that, while his delegation also expressed revulsion at attempts to glorify or otherwise promote Nazi ideology and condemned all forms of religious intolerance or hatred, it remained concerned that the draft resolution failed to distinguish between actions and statements that, while offensive, should be protected by freedom of expression and criminal actions motivated by bias, which should always be prohibited. The United States of America did not consider curtailing expression to be an appropriate or effective means of combating racism and related intolerance. Out of its conviction that individual freedoms of speech, expression and association should be robustly protected, even if the ideas expressed were full of hatred, his Government had submitted a reservation to article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The best antidote to intolerance was a combination of robust legal protections against discrimination and hate crimes, proactive government outreach to minority religious groups, and the vigorous defence of both freedom of religion and freedom of expression.

32. *At the request of the delegation of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.60.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Georgia, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New

Guinea, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Samoa, San Marino, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Vanuatu.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.60 was adopted by 120 votes to 22, with 31 abstentions.*

34. **Ms. Wilson** (Jamaica) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the resolution on the understanding that operative paragraph 18 did not imply any restriction on access to or freedom of information, including access to the Internet.

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.62)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.62: Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination

35. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

36. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that since the introduction of the draft resolution, Angola, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Iran, Lesotho, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, the Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic had joined the sponsors.

37. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Benin, Ghana, Mozambique, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda, and the United Republic of Tanzania had become sponsors.

38. **Ms. Grabianowska** (Poland), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, Iceland, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Liechtenstein, Norway, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union recognized the adverse impact produced by contemporary mercenaries on the length and nature of armed conflicts and condemned any link between mercenaries and terrorist activities. However, neither the Committee nor the Human Rights Council was the proper forum for addressing mercenary activity, as the matter should not be tackled from the perspective of human rights or of the threat posed by such activity to the rights of peoples to self-determination. Moreover, it was not appropriate to refer to private military and security companies in the draft resolution. It would be false and misleading to equate the employees of private military and security companies that operated in strict compliance with international law with mercenaries. Several branches of international law and other instruments, such as the Montreux Document, could provide a framework for regulating, monitoring and setting professional standards for the activity of such companies. In the absence of a common understanding on important definitions and approaches to the issue, the Member States of the European Union would, as in previous years, vote against the draft resolution.

39. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that the most effective way to address concerns about the accountability of private security companies and military contractors was through better implementation of existing national and international laws and robust collaborative efforts that brought together industry, civil society and Governments to work directly on raising standards. Examples were the Montreux Document and the International Code of Conduct for Private Security Service Providers.

40. At the inter-governmental Working Group meeting in Geneva, several delegations and experts had expressed the view that the Group should consider alternatives to elaborating a convention. Unfortunately, the draft resolution prejudged the ongoing work of the Group, strayed from the original mandate of considering the possibility of elaborating an international regulatory framework, and supported a poorly considered, legally binding instrument where additional law was not presently needed.

41. Any attempt to build on the unworkable and inappropriately broad draft convention previously proposed by the Working Group on the use of mercenaries would launch a time-consuming, resource-intensive process unlikely to yield practical results. The draft convention in its current wording would likely prohibit military and police training programmes provided by private companies, making it difficult for many countries to obtain necessary training services and hindering United Nations humanitarian and peacekeeping efforts, many of which relied on private contractors. It would even cover topics not appropriately regulated in such a convention, including information security or material support to militaries.

Lastly, domestic and international efforts should be allowed to mature so as to further distil best practices before a decision on formal drafting of a convention was taken. For those reasons, his delegation was obliged to request a vote and would vote against the draft resolution.

42. *At the request of the delegation of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.62.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Chile, Colombia, Fiji, Mexico, Switzerland.

43. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.62 was adopted by 118 votes to 52, with 5 abstentions.*

44. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina) said that the Argentine Republic fully supported the right to self-determination of peoples that were still under colonial domination or foreign occupation. The right to self-determination should be interpreted in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2625 (XXV) and other relevant United Nations resolutions.

45. The exercise of the right to self-determination presupposed that there was an active subject in the form of a people subject to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, as defined in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Without such a subject, there was no right to self-determination. The Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas had been unlawfully occupied by the United Kingdom, which had expelled the Argentine population and authorities in order to install its own population there. Therefore, it was not the right to self-determination, but rather the other important principle of decolonization, territorial integrity, that should apply.

46. All of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Special Committee on decolonization had highlighted the special and particular colonial situation of the Malvinas Islands, recognizing the existence of a sovereignty dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom and noting that the way to resolve that dispute was through the resumption of bilateral negotiations with a view to finding a just, peaceful and lasting solution as soon as possible, taking into account the interests of the islanders.

47. **Mr. Duddy** (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom had no doubt concerning its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands. The British Government attached great importance to the principle of self-determination, as set out in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter and article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. That principle underlined his Government's position on the Falkland Islands. No negotiations would be held on that subject unless and until such time as the islanders themselves so desired.

48. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina), reiterating the statement delivered by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina before the Special Committee on decolonization on 21 June 2011, recalled that the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas were an integral part of Argentine national territory and that, being illegally occupied by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, they were the object of a sovereignty dispute between the two countries. That dispute was recognized by various international organizations and numerous General Assembly and Special Committee resolutions, which called on the parties to resume negotiations in order to reach, as soon as possible, a peaceful and lasting solution. The Argentine Republic affirmed its legitimate sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.23/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.23/Rev.1: International Covenants on Human Rights

49. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

50. **Mr. Gomez** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, said that since the introduction of the draft resolution, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia and San Marino had joined the sponsors. The current version of the draft resolution was short and procedural and had retained only indispensable operative paragraphs. The General Assembly's adoption of a resolution in support of both the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights would demonstrate the membership's broad support for the fundamental rights contained in the Covenants and the strength of treating both instruments in a single resolution.

51. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Benin, Bhutan, Ecuador, Honduras, India, Madagascar, Paraguay, the United Republic of Tanzania and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

52. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, thanked the main sponsors for developing a streamlined resolution that commanded broad support and welcomed the good work and efforts of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of the Human Rights Committee. His delegation was pleased to join in that consensus.

53. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted.*

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.31/Rev.1, A/C.3/66/L.39 and A/C.3/66/L.45/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.31/Rev.1: The universal, indivisible, interrelated, interdependent and mutually reinforcing nature of all human rights and fundamental freedoms

54. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

55. **Mr. Andrade** (Brazil), speaking also on behalf of India and South Africa, said that Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cape Verde, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Indonesia, Liberia, Nepal, Peru, Paraguay, Portugal, Rwanda, Ukraine and Uruguay had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

56. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Benin, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, the Niger, Timor-Leste, Turkey and the United Republic of Tanzania had also joined the sponsors.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.31/Rev.1 was adopted.*

58. **Ms. Grabianowska** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that its member countries

attached the same importance to economic, social and cultural rights as to civil and political rights. All human rights were universal, interdependent and interrelated and must receive the same emphasis, as under the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. It was unfortunate that the right to development was the only right singled out twice in a draft resolution devoted to the interdependence of all human rights. Moreover, the seventh preambular paragraph should be interpreted in the light of the principle of the primary responsibility of States to promote and protect human rights. The reference in that paragraph to "equal and fair treatment" of human rights did not prejudge the language in section I.5 of the Vienna Declaration.

59. **Ms. Fontana** (Switzerland) said that her delegation had joined the consensus, but was concerned that certain aspects of the draft resolution might be interpreted as calling into question what had been achieved in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. All human rights were interdependent and should receive equal emphasis, so it was not clear why the draft resolution should emphasize the right to development.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.39: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

60. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

61. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, China, the Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Myanmar, Namibia, the Niger, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Swaziland, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

62. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea, the Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Vanuatu had also joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

63. **Ms. Grabianowska** (Poland), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union, said that it was necessary to continue to work towards a democratic and equitable world order, but several elements in the draft resolution went far beyond the scope of the Committee, were cited out of context and were not addressed in a holistic or comprehensive way. Moreover, the establishment of a new mandate of independent expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable order as set out in Human Rights Council resolution 18/6 added no value to the promotion and protection of human rights. The members of the European Union would thus vote against the draft resolution.

64. *At the request of the delegation of Poland, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.39.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada,

Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru.

65. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.39 was adopted by 117 votes to 52, with 6 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.45/Rev.1: Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons

66. **Ms. Merchant** (Norway) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.45/Rev.1, which showed that the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement were more robust than ever. The draft resolution contained new elements, such as reference to the African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa, and to climate change, environmental degradation and increased risk of natural hazards, which, in combination with other risk factors, could be viewed as a driver of displacement.

67. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Chile, the Czech Republic, Ireland, Madagascar, Mali, the Niger, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Agenda item 107: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.17)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.17: United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

68. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

69. **Ms. Kafeero** (Uganda), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the efforts of the United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders enhanced the capacity of African States.

70. A number of revisions had been made to the draft resolution. In the fourth preambular paragraph, the words "money laundering" had been inserted after the word "piracy"; in the fifth preambular paragraph, the word "processes" had been added after "litigation"; the eighth preambular paragraph had been revised to read "*Recognizing* the importance of promoting sustainable development as a complement to crime prevention strategies". Paragraph 5 had been revised to read "*Encourages* the Institute, in cooperation with relevant United Nations agencies, take into account the various planning authorities in the region that focus attention on the coordination of activities that promote development based on sustainable agricultural production and preservation of the environment in developing its crime prevention strategies". In paragraph 11, the word "significantly" had been replaced with "greatly".

71. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.17, as orally revised, was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

United Nations A/C.3/66/SR.46

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
7 February 2012

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 46th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 18 November 2011, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Haniff. ..... (Malaysia)

Contents

Agenda item 27: Social development including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 66: Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)

(a) Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights: Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(b) Promotion and protection of human rights: Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

11-59976 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m.

Agenda item 27: Social development including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.8/Rev.1: Promoting social integration through social inclusion

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Román-Morey** (Peru) said that the draft resolution recognized the obligation of the State to promote policies of social inclusion directed toward creating a society for all based on respect for human rights, equality, access to basic services and promotion of individual participation.

3. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Finland, India, Italy, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Mali, Mauritania, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Romania, Senegal, Slovenia, Suriname, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Netherlands and Tunisia had joined the sponsors.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.*

5. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to express reservations about the fourteenth preambular paragraph, which it felt was not germane to the subject of the draft resolution. Progress toward social inclusion was driven primarily by policies and practices; market access and debt relief were important issues but were not pertinent to the issue at stake. The draft resolution would benefit from a more focused approach to issues more directly connected with social inclusion.

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.20/Rev.1 Women and political participation

6. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

7. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that Algeria, Belize, Egypt, Jamaica, Morocco, the Philippines, Samoa, San Marino, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Thailand had joined the sponsors.

8. Several changes had been made to the text during the consultations. In the fifth preambular paragraph, "all" was to be inserted between "supporting" and "countries", and "worldwide" at the end of the paragraph deleted. In the seventh preambular paragraph, "may" should be inserted between "transition" and "provide". In the eighth preambular paragraph, "all" was to be inserted between "of" and "human". In the tenth preambular paragraph, the words "and cultural" should be deleted. In the twelfth preambular paragraph, the sixth and seventh lines should be deleted and replaced by the phrase "and its subsequent follow-up resolutions, as well as other relevant United Nations resolutions".

9. In paragraph 6, the words "in accordance with" should be replaced by "within"; "national" was to be inserted between "their" and "efforts". In subparagraph (l), "reduction of" should be substituted for "reducing". In paragraph 10, "the participation of women" was to be changed to "women's participation", and "in democratic political activities" was to be changed to "in political and other leadership activities". In paragraph 11, "throughout the United Nations system" was to be deleted; the phrase "in all phases of the political process" should be added after "participation"; and "including on the participation of women in times of political transition" should be changed to "including in times of political changes and reform." In paragraph 12, "inter alia", should be added after "focus".

10. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Germany, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Suriname, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Uganda, Uruguay, Vanuatu and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

11. **Ms. Alsaleh** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that her delegation had participated actively in informal discussions of the draft resolution, out of its firm belief

in the importance of granting priority to women's advancement. The participation of Syrian women in all areas of life was on the rise. Women had been granted the vote in the early 20th century, and their progress had culminated in the recognition and enshrinement of full equality in the Syrian constitution. Women had held the post of Vice-President and were increasingly represented in other high-level posts.

12. Her delegation expressed disappointment and deep concern at the lack of cooperation on the part of the main sponsors in addressing the concerns of a number of delegations including her own, with the pretext that the text was drafted according to the wishes of the sponsors, as if the resolution was to be implemented only by those countries. The paragraphs that referred to a so-called "political transition" were of particular concern. Member States could hardly demand agreement on a term that had not been formally defined, something that the facilitators had themselves acknowledged throughout consultations. Her delegation was particularly surprised that those delegations had agreed on the notion of so-called constructive ambiguity, which further obscured the term.

13. Her delegation refused to enter into semantic mazes and ill-defined terms, which it would not accept as it appeared in the text or in any subsequent draft resolutions implying consensus. She hoped that, in future, the facilitator would address the concerns of all delegations on an equal footing.

14. **Ms. Farngalo** (Liberia) said that her country attached great importance to the advancement and empowerment of women and strengthening the leadership role of women in politics. The participation of women in peace processes and post-conflict reconstruction and development was crucial to the sustainability of peace and security. During Liberia's political transition, the women had made an effective contribution to peace negotiation and mediation and peacebuilding and in bringing about an end to 14 years of brutality and unwarranted suffering. Accelerated enhancement of women's political participation and engagement was needed, and her delegation recognized the draft resolution as an engine toward that end; it therefore encouraged Member States to adopt the draft resolution.

15. **Ms. Rasheed** (Maldives) said that her Government placed great emphasis on women's rights and the political transition process, and supported political participation by women in all areas and particularly during transitions. It was pleased with the proposed text, and appreciated the flexibility shown by the facilitator and the sponsors in their effort to accommodate the concerns of all the delegations. Her country would have preferred retention of the stronger references to democracy and political transition that had ultimately been removed in the spirit of compromise and agreement.

16. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted as orally revised.*

17. **Mr. Ferami** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had joined the consensus out of a belief that participation by women in the political process should be viewed not as a privilege but as an obligation of the Government to ensure equality and equal opportunity. His country had achieved very good progress with regard to participation by women in the political process, and his delegation therefore subscribed to the spirit and objectives of the resolution.

18. His delegation wished, however, to record its dissatisfaction with the undiplomatic, arrogant, and impudent manner in which the informal consultations had been conducted. It was the sovereign right of countries to align themselves with any country or any position they deemed more suitable for their national interests.

19. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that her delegation had joined the consensus because of its commitment to political participation by women and the promotion of women's rights in all societies and under all circumstances. However, it wished to record its concern at the inclusion in the text of the phrase "states in political transition", a phrase which lacked a universally agreed meaning. It also regretted that such an important issue had been included in a resolution where it was foreign to the main subject. The defence of the political participation of women in all circumstances was a priority for the Organisation, and should not be used to promote specific interests that distorted its purpose.

20. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had joined the consensus, inasmuch as political participation by women and gender equality were Government policies. Given the importance that her delegation attached to the draft resolution, however, it

regretted the arbitrariness displayed by the principal sponsor and the co-sponsors during the negotiations, undermining the main purpose of the draft resolution through the incorporation of imprecise terminology, specifically the repeated references to "political transition". Her delegation had reservations on the use of that term throughout the text. It also expressed its dissatisfaction that the concerns and critical positions of all delegations had not been taken into account.

21. **Mr. Butt** (Pakistan) said that his country welcomed the draft resolution for its contribution to the goal of promoting broader political participation by women. Women had held a variety of leadership positions in his country, including prime minister. It therefore supported the aims and objectives of the draft resolution and had joined the consensus. However, in the view of his delegation, the draft resolution should have addressed the issues in a broader format without bringing in controversial and undefined concepts such as "situations of political transition", which unnecessarily created controversy. It would also have been appropriate to situate activities in the context of political participation rather than in the general context of human rights. His delegation regretted that its constructive proposals had not been accommodated by the sponsors, but nevertheless looked forward to concerted action by all Member States to promote political participation by women at all levels and in all fields.

22. **Ms. Medal** (Nicaragua) said that in view of her country's promotion of participation by women in social and political areas her delegation had supported the draft resolution, but it wished to place on record its regret at the way in which consensus had been reached, and the neglect of the concerns of certain delegations.

23. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that his country attached great importance to equality between men and women and considered the participation of women in political life to be very important. It had therefore joined the consensus on the draft resolution. However, the focus on the issue of participation by women in political life in States undergoing political transition created imbalance and constituted a distraction from the main issue, the enhancement of participation by women everywhere irrespective of political, social and economic conditions.

24. With respect to the reference to the working group studying discrimination against women in legislation, his delegation noted that the activities of any special procedure needed to be in strict compliance with its mandate, and that any expansion of competencies or functions required the introduction of relevant amendments in resolutions. His delegation considered it inadmissible for that mechanism to be bypassed and for the interpretation of the working group's mandate to be expanded to give it the additional function of looking at the participation of women in political life, particularly in the context of implementation of the resolution at issue.

Agenda item 66: Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)

(a) Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.26/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.26/Rev.1: Rights of indigenous peoples

25. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the programme budget implications of paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, said that, should the draft resolution be adopted by the General Assembly, it was envisaged that the high-level event to be held during the eleventh session of the Forum to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, to be held from 7 to 18 May 2012, would comprise one meeting requiring interpretation into all six official languages, with additional requirements of $18,000 for interpretation and other meeting support services. Nevertheless, those additional requirements would be absorbed within the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

26. As for the words "within existing resources" in the same paragraph, he drew attention to the provisions of section IV of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990 and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which was resolution 64/243 of 24 December 2009.

27. Should the draft resolution be adopted, no additional programme budget implications would arise for the biennium 2012-2013.

28. **Mr. Archondo** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said that Austria, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Germany,

Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Liberia, New Zealand, Poland, Slovenia, Spain and the United States of America had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. During the negotiations on the draft resolution, States parties and indigenous peoples had shown great interest in the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples to be held in 2014. He urged all delegations to participate actively in the negotiations on the modalities which would soon begin. Lastly, he drew attention to a minor editorial correction to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. He asked the Secretariat to correct paragraph 1 of the draft resolution by deleting "as well as his most recent report".

29. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Armenia, Belarus, the Central African Republic, Chile, the Congo, Costa Rica and Côte d'Ivoire had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

30. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that his Government had made a priority of strengthening government-to-government relationships with federally recognized tribes and working jointly to address issues facing Native Americans. It looked forward to working with the international community to turn the aspirations of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples into reality.

31. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted.*

32. **Ms. Boutin** (Canada) said that her Government was pleased to have joined consensus on the draft resolution. The Declaration was not legally binding and did not reflect customary international law nor change Canadian laws. For that reason, her Government continued to have reservations particularly on the eighth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. Canada reaffirmed its commitment to building on a positive and productive relationship with First Nations, Inuits and Métis people to improve the well-being of Aboriginal Canadians based on a shared history, respect and desire to move forward together.

33. **Mr. Preston** (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that his delegation was pleased to have joined consensus on the draft resolution, and was fully committed to promoting and protecting human rights for all individuals, including indigenous people, without discrimination. His Government continued to work overseas and through multilateral institutions to improve the situation of indigenous people internationally, and had provided political and financial support to the economic, social and political development of indigenous peoples around the world and would continue to do so.

34. It fully recognized that indigenous individuals were entitled to the full protection of their human rights and fundamental freedoms in international law, on an equal basis with all other individuals. Since equality and universality were the fundamental principles underpinning human rights, it was unacceptable that some groups in society should benefit from human rights not available to others. With the exception of the right of self-determination, it thus did not accept the concept of collective human rights in international law. It was important to ensure that individuals within groups were not left vulnerable or unprotected by allowing the rights of the group to supersede the human rights of the individual. Nevertheless, his Government recognized that the Governments of many States with indigenous populations had granted them various collective rights, which strengthened the political and economic position of and protection for the rights of indigenous peoples in those States.

35. His Government thus understood any internationally agreed reference to the rights of indigenous peoples, including in the Declaration, to refer to those rights bestowed at the national level by Governments to indigenous peoples and according to its stated position on human rights and collective rights.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.32, A/C.3/66/L.37, A/C.3/66/L.43/Rev.1, A/C.3/66/L.71 and A/C.3/66/L.45/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.32: Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

36. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

37. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that China and Paraguay had joined the sponsors.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.32 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.37: Strengthening United Nations action in the field of human rights through the promotion of international cooperation and the importance of non-selectivity, impartiality and objectivity

39. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

40. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that consultations and bilateral meetings on the draft resolution had resulted in an oral amendment to delete the entire seventh preambular paragraph, and to delete the word "further" from the eight preambular paragraph. Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Pakistan, Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

41. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Cape Verde, Colombia, Honduras, Nigeria, and Swaziland had also joined the sponsors.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.37, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.43/Rev.1: Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization

43. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

44. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that Bosnia and Herzegovina, Central African Republic, Georgia, Indonesia, Libya, the Philippines, Thailand, Tunisia and Ukraine had joined the sponsors. The text reaffirmed that democracy was a universal value based on the freely expressed will of the people to determine their own political, economic, social and cultural systems and their full participation in all aspects of their lives. It included new elements recognizing the importance of fair, periodic, and genuine elections, including in new democracies and countries undergoing democratization, in order to empower citizens to express their will and promote successful transition to sustainable democracies.

45. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Mali, Mauritania and Timor-Leste had joined the sponsors.

46. **The Chair** called the attention of the Committee to draft amendment A/C.3/66/L.71 to draft resolution A/C.3/L.43/Rev.1. He had been informed that the amendment contained no programme budget implications.

47. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that the issues raised in draft resolution L.43/Rev.1 were extremely important for strengthening democratic institutions in the Member States. However, the sponsors of the draft resolution had not been prepared to incorporate two key elements, which his delegation had placed in an amendment contained in document A/C.3/66/L.71.

48. Paragraph 1 of the amendment reflected his delegation's conviction that States bore the primary responsibility for organizing and holding elections and that the United Nations should provide assistance only at the request of national Governments and maintain neutrality and impartiality. Also, United Nations observer missions should issue an assessment regarding the outcome of an election only when they had a mandate to do so and only after an announcement of the results of such election by the competent national authority of the relevant State. To act otherwise could undermine the fragile process of building democratic institutions or even provoke armed conflict, particularly in situations where the United Nations was assisting post-conflict recovery or peacebuilding.

49. Paragraph 2 of the amendment reflected his delegation's wish, as expressed at the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly, to remove the reference to the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, which had not been developed as part of an intergovernmental process, but by representatives of civil society. His delegation was opposed in principle to the attempt to legitimize, by a General Assembly resolution, a document developed by a group of non-governmental organizations when that document had not been discussed at the intergovernmental level. His delegation fully supported the aim of harmonizing the methods and standards used in international election observation as expressed in the first part of paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

50. His delegation believed that the above amendment would make the draft resolution more

balanced. If the amendment was unacceptable to the sponsors of the draft resolution, he asked the Committee to vote separately on the two paragraphs contained in the amendment. Belarus, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Nicaragua, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors of the amendment.

51. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that his country did not agree to the amendment, and was amenable to the suggestion that the two amending paragraphs should be voted on separately.

52. **Mr. Selim** (Egypt) asked for clarification concerning the rule under which the vote was taking place.

53. **The Chair** said that it was taking place under Rule 130, of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly.

54. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment to paragraph 3 and in favour of retaining the current text. The United States had facilitated open and transparent negotiations, and had included many amendments to the text, including many suggested by the Russian delegation. Regrettably, the Russian delegation had chosen to propose amendments to two paragraphs, thus forcing a vote on the draft resolution. The issue raised concerning paragraph 3 was outside the scope of a Third Committee resolution. The proposal was clearly the outcome of Russian dissatisfaction with the election certification in Côte d'Ivoire. The appropriate place for the Russian delegation to address their concerns with that mandate, was in the United Nations Security Council. His delegation hoped that the integrity of the text as a human rights resolution aimed at ensuring support requested by countries for the conduct of free and fair elections would be preserved.

55. **Mr. Selim** (Egypt), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that Egypt attached great importance to the draft resolution, which it had supported in the past and would continue to support. Egypt recognized the important role of the United Nations in providing technical assistance to Governments. That role had to be carried out in an objective, impartial, neutral, and independent manner, and with full respect for the principle of national ownership of the election process, including the announcement of the outcome by the national authorities. His country would therefore vote in favour of the amendment to paragraph 3.

56. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by the Russian Federation contained in paragraph 1 of A/C.3/66/L.71.*

In favour:

Algeria, Armenia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Malaysia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ghana, Grenada, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Libya, Mongolia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Saint

Lucia, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania.

57. *The proposed amendment contained in paragraph 1 of A/C.3/66/L.71 was rejected by 75 votes to 55, with 26 abstentions.*

58. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment to paragraph 9 and in favour of retaining the current text. The Russian delegation was seeking in the proposal, to delete consensus language that had been agreed on and principles that had been endorsed by the African Union, the European Commission and the Organization of American States, among other organisations.

59. **Mr. Selim** (Egypt), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that Egypt recognized that international observation was one of many factors contributing to fair, transparent, and genuine national elections, while also recognizing that regulating the process was within the competence of each Member State and had to be conducted in accordance with the State's national legislation and regulations, and in full cooperation with the non-governmental organisation observers. Egypt respected its obligations under documents that had been negotiated and adopted, with its participation, within the United Nations or other regional intergovernmental organizations of which it was a member. It was not bound by documents negotiated and/or adopted outside a comprehensive intergovernmental framework that had not adopted by the Heads of State and Government of the African Union, a situation that applied in the case of the Declaration of Principles. Egypt would therefore vote in favour of the amendment.

60. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by the Russian Federation contained in paragraph 2 of A/C.3/66/L.71.*

In favour:

Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Grenada, India, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libya, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania.

61. *The amendment proposed by the Russian Federation contained in paragraph 2 of A/C.3/66/L.71 was rejected by 88 votes to 29, with 32 abstentions.*

62. **Mr. Abdullah** (Malaysia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation greatly appreciated the initiative of the United States delegation and its collaborative work with other delegations. His country believed that the electoral assistance provided by the United Nations should continue to be carried out in an objective, impartial, neutral, and independent manner, and took note of the efforts made to harmonize the regulations and standards set forth in the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of

Conduct for International Election Observers. However, it was concerned at the absence of any intergovernmental involvement in the process leading up to the introduction of the Declaration and the Code. The United Nations must refrain from making any statement on the outcome of any election process before the official results had been announced by the national authorities. The amending paragraphs proposed by the Russian Federation would have strengthened the resolution, and his delegation had therefore voted in favour.

63. *Draft resolution L.43/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted.*

64. **Mr. Butt** (Pakistan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his country considered the holding of periodic general elections to be an important element of the democratization process. While it was the responsibility of each State to ensure free and fair elections, the United Nations could provide valuable technical assistance to Member States when requested, and Pakistan was actively engaged with the United Nations in that regard. Such electoral assistance must be carried out in an objective, impartial, and neutral manner. International observation was also important for the promotion of free and fair elections. However, his delegation was not comfortable with the reference in paragraph 9 to the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation, which contained controversial language and was not an intergovernmental document. His country had therefore supported the amending paragraphs proposed in A/C.3/66/L.71, which strengthened the text. It nevertheless agreed with the overall direction and substance of the resolution, and therefore supported the text as of the draft resolution a whole.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.45/Rev.1: Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons

65. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

66. **Ms. Merchant** (Norway) said that Albania, Bulgaria, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, France, Japan, Liberia, Lithuania, Portugal, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, Thailand, Uganda, Ukraine and United States of America had joined the sponsors.

67. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Costa Rica, Ecuador, Estonia, Honduras, Malta, Mexico, San Marino, Serbia, Switzerland, Timor-Leste and Uruguay had also joined the sponsors.

68. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted.*

69. **Ms. Grabianowska** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union was a strong advocate of the human rights of and a major provider of assistance to internally displaced persons. It strongly supported the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons including the mainstreaming of their human rights into all parts of the United Nations system and their protection and assistance in peace, reintegration and rehabilitation processes. The European Union understood that all the United Nations resolutions referred to in paragraph 8 of the draft resolution just adopted comprised both General Assembly and Security Council resolutions consistent with previous General Assembly resolutions on that topic.

The meeting rose at 12:05 p.m.

United Nations A/C.3/66/SR.47

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
9 February 2012

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 47th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 21 November 2011, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Haniff ..... (Malaysia)

Contents

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

11-60219 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m.

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.69/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.69/Rev.1: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

1. **Ms. Sulimani** (Sierra Leone), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the African Group, said that in addition to the sponsors cited in the document, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Japan, Luxembourg, Switzerland and the United Kingdom had become sponsors. The draft resolution was based on resolution 65/193 and contained the usual technical updates, including new elements to reflect key developments concerning refugees on the African continent, particularly in the Horn of Africa and North Africa.

2. A number of revisions had been made to the text of the draft resolution. At the beginning of the third preambular paragraph, the word "*Recalling*" had been changed to "*Welcoming*". The last line of paragraph 11 had been reworded to read "support the sustainability of voluntary return, reintegration and resettlement". In paragraph 21, the phrase "to intensify their support" had been replaced by the words "to continue, and where appropriate, intensify their support".

3. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, the Central African Republic, Chile, the Czech Republic, Finland, Haiti, Honduras, India, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America had become sponsors.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.44/Rev.1)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.54, L.55/Rev.1, L.56 and L.70)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.44/Rev.1: Promotion of the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

4. **Ms. Merchant** (Norway), introducing the draft resolution, said that its main goal was to promote the implementation of the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders, as well as to support the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. The draft resolution had been subject to several informal and bilateral consultations and many concessions had been made. Several delegations had demonstrated considerable flexibility, for which her delegation was extremely grateful. Andorra, Armenia, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, Guatemala, Honduras, Jordan, Malta, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, San Marino, Senegal, the United States of America and Vanuatu had joined the sponsors.

5. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Cyprus, Haiti, Mali, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine and Uruguay had become sponsors.

6. **The Chair** invited to the Committee to resume consideration of sub-item (c) of agenda item 69.

7. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the group of the Non-Aligned Movement, said that she wished to reiterate its firm stance with regard to the ongoing selectivity, double standards and politicization reflected in the resolutions on human rights in developing countries which were members of the Group. The Sixteenth Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement in Bali had emphasized the role of the Human Rights Council as the United Nations body principally responsible for consideration of the human rights situation in all countries without distinction. Its universal periodic review was the appropriate mechanism to consider all human rights issues without distinction and on the basis of cooperation and constructive dialogue.

8. At the Bali Ministerial Conference, heads of State and Government had expressed deep concern with regard to country-specific draft resolutions in the Third Committee, which undermined cooperation. The practice amounted to the exploitation of human rights issues to suit a political agenda and went against the principles of universality and objectivity that should

underlie all considerations of human rights in both developed and developing countries. The draft resolutions before the Third Committee were based on the political motivations of certain States and undermined the credibility of United Nations human rights mechanisms. She therefore called on all delegations to vote against any resolution which targeted specific countries.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.54: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

9. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

10. **Mr. Herczyński** (Poland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and the sponsors, said that the Marshall Islands, Palau, Tuvalu and Vanuatu had joined the sponsors. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea had made no substantial effort to address the concerns of the international community with regard to the human rights situation in that country. If the world did not react, a signal would be sent that international concern had decreased or that the situation had improved, which was not the case.

11. The General Assembly could not ignore the suffering of the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and should, with the adoption of the draft resolution, urge its Government to put an immediate end to its human rights violations. While a negotiation process to address the issues contained in the draft resolution would have been preferable, the Government had refused to engage in any discussion. His delegation therefore strongly encouraged all Member States to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

12. **Mr. Kim Song** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation unequivocally rejected the draft resolution as no human rights violations of the sort described in it had occurred in his country. It was a politically motivated document that politicized the issue of human rights and whose aim was to stoke confrontation. Although his Government reiterated its willingness to engage in dialogue, it could not compromise on the draft resolution, which had nothing to do with human rights and everything to do with politics. It was a typical example of the selectivity and double standards that characterized the Human Rights Council.

13. Human rights violations committed by Western nations, including mass killings committed in Iraq and Afghanistan by the United States of America, had never been brought up for scrutiny, nor had the human rights situations in many countries which sponsored the draft resolution been taken into account, including sexual violence, torture, racial discrimination and the maltreatment of immigrants and indigenous peoples. In addition developing countries had been coerced into sponsoring the draft resolution through economic pressure in the form of aid.

14. Since the draft resolution was the product of political manipulation and pressure, it could never be an accurate reflection of the will of the international community. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea would never accept it even if it were adopted. His delegation requested a vote on the draft resolution and thanked all Member States that supported his country's position.

15. **Mr. Nishida** (Japan) said that the promotion and protection of human rights were legitimate concerns of the international community. His country believed that those concerns should generally be addressed through dialogue and cooperation. However, there were grave concerns with regard to the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which should be addressed through he adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.54.

16. The universal periodic review was a valuable opportunity for all countries to review their respective human rights situations and to accept its recommendations. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea had joined the process in December 2009 but had not yet accepted any of the 167 recommendations that had been made. It had likewise refused to engage in any dialogue and constructive cooperation with regard to the special procedures mandated by the Human Rights Council. The abduction issue remained outstanding, with 12 of the 17 Japanese nationals identified by his Government as having been abducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea not yet returned. His country urged the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to establish an investigative committee without delay as the abduction issue represented a fundamental violation of human rights.

17. There was concern that the universal periodic review was not adequately addressing the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It was important, therefore, for the Human Rights Council and the entire international community

through the General Assembly to express their collective concern regarding the human rights situation in general and the abduction issue in particular. He urged all delegations to adopt the draft resolution and hoped that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would accept its recommendations.

18. **Ms. Li** Xiaomei (China), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her country believed that differences in the human rights arena should be addressed through dialogue and cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual respect. It was opposed to using country-specific resolutions to exert pressure or to establish country-specific human rights mechanisms. Politicized finger-pointing could not improve a country's human rights situation and only provoked meaningless confrontations.

19. Her country welcomed the cooperation between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and UNICEF, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the World Food Programme and other agencies. It called on the international community to take a pragmatic and constructive attitude with regard to the economic and social development challenges faced by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and provide more effective humanitarian assistance in order to create a favourable international environment to promote progress, stability and human rights in that country. On that basis, China would vote against the draft resolution.

20. **Ms. Alsaleh** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that her delegation wished to express its regret over the insistence of some States to introduce draft resolutions dealing with the human rights situations in specific countries for political reasons. The practice threatened the credibility of political and legal reference points in the framework of international relations and undermined international consensus on the machinery dealing with human rights.

21. Her delegation wished to reaffirm its opposition in principle to such initiatives based on the Syrian Arab Republic's refusal to invoke human rights issues selectively in order to interfere in the internal affairs of Member States on humanitarian and legal pretexts. Doing so contradicted the Charter of the United Nations, which affirmed the principle of the sovereign equality of all Member States. Human rights issues should be dealt with in the appropriate forum, namely the Human Rights Council, which reviewed questions of human rights in all Member States and not in specific States. The Syrian Arab Republic would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

22. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation associated itself with the statement made by the Cuban delegation on behalf of the group of the Non-Aligned Movement. Venezuela would vote against the draft resolution because it opposed the practice of some States with political agendas to introduce country specific resolutions on human rights issues without due respect for the principle of sovereign equality. It was inconceivable that some countries used human rights as a political weapon against others.

23. Her delegation likewise deplored the fact that year after year the majority of countries in the Third Committee had been subjected to political manipulation by those countries which sponsored draft resolutions that pointed fingers at and criminalized other States. The General Assembly should not be used for such despicable ends. It was the Human Rights Council, through the universal periodic review, which was mandated to examine human rights situations based on impartial and objective evaluations, and the Third Committee should immediately end all accusatory practices.

24. **Mr. Chigejo** (Zimbabwe) said that, although human rights had become a universal issue extending beyond national boundaries, the promotion and protection of human rights remained first and foremost the responsibility of the individual States concerned. If other countries or non-State entities had any concerns regarding human rights that they believed merited the attention of the international community, they should make suggestions or offer assistance to the countries in question to help them address those issues. However all such engagements should be undertaken through consultative dialogue, impartiality, objectivity, transparency and in full respect for the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of State sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

25. The presentation of country-specific draft resolutions contradicted those guiding principles and constituted politically motivated attacks by certain powerful countries seeking to interfere in the internal affairs of others. They also undermined cooperation as the essential principle to effectively promote respect

for human rights. Zimbabwe would, therefore, vote against the draft resolution.

26. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that her Government maintained a traditional position against country-specific resolutions which sought to selectively accuse countries of the South on the basis of clear political motivations without any relationship to the real defence of human rights. Such harmful practices had been responsible for discrediting the former Commission on Human Rights and had led to its disappearance. Only genuine international cooperation based on the principles of impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity could ensure the promotion and effective protection of human rights. The Human Rights Council with its universal periodic review mechanism was the proper forum for the examination of human rights. Cuba would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

27. **Mr. Gurung** (Nepal) said that his country supported the concerns expressed in the draft resolution, particularly with regard to the issue of abductions. It opposed any form of enforced disappearance as it contravened fundamental tenets of human rights and called on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to resolve those concerns. However, country-specific resolutions on human rights situations should be addressed by the Human Rights Council through the universal periodic review. There should be greater engagement in developing thematic issues through the Council, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, treaty bodies, special procedures and human rights mechanisms. Nepal would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

28. *At the request of the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.54.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

Algeria, Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Oman, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia.

29. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.54 was adopted by 112 votes to 16, with 55 abstentions.**

30. **Mr. Abdullah** (Malaysia) said that his country believed in a non-confrontational approach in all inter-State matters, including on the issue of human rights, preferring constructive and respectful dialogue and cooperation with the aim of improving the state of affairs with due respect for the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of all Member States. It did not support resolutions targeting specific countries, regardless of the system of governance of the country involved. Malaysia had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

31. Human rights should not be exploited for political gains, including through the selective targeting of countries, a practice which ran counter to the Charter and the universal periodic review mechanism. His country took note of developments in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the challenges that it and the United Nations both faced with regard to the recommendations put forward in the universal periodic review of the Human Rights Council. It hoped that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and United Nations could agree on a solution with regard to the work of the Special Rapporteur.

32. **Mr. Khan** (Indonesia) said that his country wished to express its full support for the work of the international community in protecting and promoting human rights. It believed however that such efforts should be based on mutual respect and genuine international dialogue and cooperation. One of the main reasons for the reform of the human rights mechanism, and particularly for the creation of the Human Rights Council, had been to allow for a non-politicized and more credible consideration of country-specific situations.

33. The universal periodic review of the Human Rights Council provided a mechanism for assessing the human rights situation in all Member States on an equal basis. It was of the utmost importance that it should be optimized in order to eliminate selectivity, double standards and politicization. Indonesia had therefore been unable to support the draft resolution. Nevertheless it recognized that the draft resolution reflected unresolved issues in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and hoped that due consideration would be given to the issues that it addressed. Indonesia had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

34. **Mr. de Sellos** (Brazil) said that his country's support for the draft resolution reflected its concern over the lack of engagement and cooperation between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United Nations human rights system. However the vote should not be understood as a condemnation but rather as encouragement to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to strengthen its cooperation with the international human rights system. His country had taken note of the positive developments with respect to cooperation with United Nations agencies, particularly in the humanitarian field. Support from the international community for the humanitarian efforts in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was essential, and all Member States were urged to provide assistance.

35. In spite of those positive developments, his country noted with concern the reports of the Secretary-General and the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, particularly with regard to the issue of the abduction of Japanese citizens. Full cooperation with relevant authorities was urged in order to resolve the situation, including by allowing for the immediate return of the abductees. Action should also be taken to resume the process of family reunification along the border. It was unfortunate that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had not clarified its position with respect to the recommendations made in the universal periodic review, and he urged the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to cooperate with all relevant United Nations human rights bodies, including the Special Rapporteur.

36. **Ms. Velichko** (Belarus) said that her country wished to endorse the statement made by Cuba on behalf of the group of the Non-Aligned Movement. Belarus had always opposed country-specific resolutions. The General Assembly and the Third Committee should not serve as platforms for such resolutions as they undermined the role of the Human Rights Council as an objective mechanism for addressing human rights issues. The draft resolution under consideration was selective and politically motivated. No country had an ideal human rights situation, and pointing out faults in others was

* The delegation of Fiji subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

ultimately counterproductive. Belarus therefore had voted against the draft resolution.

37. **Ms. Phommachanh** (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that her delegation shared the common view of the Non-Aligned Movement that country-specific resolutions would not help to address human rights issues. Only the Human Rights Council and the universal periodic review mechanism were acceptable platforms to address the issue of human rights objectively and without prejudice. Her country had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

38. **Ms. Nguyen Cam Linh** (Viet Nam) said that her delegation had voted against the draft resolution due to its principled position of not supporting resolutions on the human rights situations in specific countries. Constructive dialogue, positive engagement and cooperation were the only appropriate and effective solutions to address human rights issues, including through the Human Rights Council and the universal periodic review. Her country shared the concern expressed in the draft resolution with respect to abductions, and extended its sympathy to the victims with the hope that the issue could be resolved.

39. **Mr. Swe** (Myanmar) said that it was inappropriate to address the issue of human rights in any specific country in the Committee. The universal periodic review of the Human Rights Council was the best mechanism to consider the human rights situations in all countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution should rather offer countries constructive advice and support through the universal periodic review process. Myanmar therefore had voted against the draft resolution.

40. **Ms. Ruin** (Costa Rica) said that her country's concern for human rights situations in specific countries as reflected in the draft resolutions before the Committee had prompted her delegation to vote in favour of two of them. At the same time, it maintained its position of principle to vote against all mentions of non-action because it prevented the international community from examining issues of interest which Member States would like to examine, including actions taken by countries to improve their human rights situations. Nevertheless, as the Human Rights Council was the main body with the competence to examine human rights issues, country-specific resolutions should not be referred to the Committee. Systematic abuses of human rights should be subject to examination, but that examination should be guided by constructive dialogue.

41. **Mr. Kim** Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation was deeply concerned by the escalation represented by the adoption of the draft resolution. Problems, including human rights issues, should be solved through negotiation and dialogue, which was incompatible with political pressure. While the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was prepared to engage in dialogue, it could not compromise in the face of a confrontational approach. It therefore rejected the draft resolution while thanking those delegations which had voted in support of his country's position. Finally, his delegation insisted that the crimes against humanity committed by Japan against the Korean people in the past should be addressed by the Committee before it undertook any further consideration of country-specific human rights resolutions. Until that happened, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was under no obligation to discuss its human rights situation.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.55/Rev.1: Situation of human rights in Myanmar

42. **The Chair** drew attention to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.55 contained in document A/C.3/66/L.70, which also applied to draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.55/Rev.1.

43. **Mr. Herczyński** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and the sponsors, said that Israel had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. The international community had long been concerned by the human rights situation in Myanmar. While those concerns remained and were reflected in the draft resolution before the Committee, some important steps had been taken recently by the Government of Myanmar with respect to national reconciliation and the human rights situation.

44. Bilateral consultations had been held with interested delegations and the Government concerned throughout the drafting process, and those discussions had resulted in some revisions of the draft text, including in the fifth and twelfth preambular paragraphs and in recognition of the progress made with respect to Myanmar's cooperation with the international community. While the sponsors of the draft resolution would have preferred a consensual approach, agreement could not be reached and a vote

would be called for. The European Union and all the sponsors would vote in favour, and he urged all delegations to do likewise.

45. **Mr. Swe** (Myanmar) said that his Government was striving to build a democratic society based on the agenda set out by the President upon his inauguration earlier that year. Implementation of the new policy guidelines, which included engagement with international and regional organizations, had resulted in the designation of Myanmar as the 2014 Chair of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) at the recent ASEAN Summit. His Government had also been receiving dignitaries from States from around the world and delegations from the United Nations and the European Union. In addition, for the first time in over 50 years, the United States Secretary of State would be visiting Myanmar in the coming weeks. His Government was clearly committed to strengthening cooperation with the international community and building a democratic State.

46. Both the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Myanmar and the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar had made several visits that year and had been accorded full cooperation. Moreover, in response to an invitation from the President, the Secretary-General would be visiting the country within the coming months. Myanmar had undergone the universal periodic review process of the Human Rights Council and was working to implement many of the resulting recommendations. The National Human Rights Commission, composed of independent experts, had been recently established and was already accepting complaints of violations. In addition, in order to promote national reconsolidation efforts, the Government had granted amnesty to prisoners, reinstated the National League for Democracy as a legal political party and was holding talks with the remaining armed groups to end armed conflicts.

47. Those were just some of the constructive measures taken during the past eight months. The Government remained committed to continuing the reform process within its capacity and resources. In those early stage of democratic reform, Myanmar deserved the understanding and sincere encouragement of the international community, not the negative approach embodied in the draft resolution under consideration. While the text did reflect some of the positive developments in the country, it failed to reflect the entire situation on the ground. His delegation deeply regretted that the main sponsor had still chosen in paragraph 1 to use language expressing grave concern "about the ongoing systematic violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of Myanmar", which was evidence of the European Union's determination to continue to exploit human rights and target specific countries for political purposes.

48. Such use of double standards, partiality and selectivity in itself constituted a violation of human rights in the context of international relations. Given that the universal periodic review process was the effective mechanism used to evaluate the human rights situation of all countries on an equal basis, such politically motivated resolutions had no place within the General Assembly. He appealed to Member States to stand in solidarity with Myanmar as a matter of principle and vote against the draft resolution.

49. **Mr. Budak** (Turkey) said that his delegation welcomed the important steps taken by the Government of Myanmar to strengthen the international community's confidence in the reform process. It hoped that actions to further open the political environment would continue.

50. **Mr. Kim** Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation firmly believed that human rights matters in a given State could not be resolved through the interference of other States. The human rights mechanisms of the United Nations were the appropriate means to address such issues without undermining trust between partners. In line with the traditional position of the Non-Aligned Movement, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

51. **Mr.** Amit **Kumar** (India) said that experience had shown that country-specific resolutions were counterproductive and his delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution. Every State should be encouraged and have access to robust mechanisms to address human rights violations. He urged the sponsors not to pursue such draft resolutions and instead recognize the significant economic and political reforms enacted by the Government of Myanmar. A more productive way forward would be to seek to engage the Government in collaborative partnerships.

52. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her Government was

firmly committed to the principles of non-interference and respect for sovereignty and would vote against the draft resolution, which politicized the protection of human rights and ran contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The Human Rights Council was the most appropriate body for addressing human rights situations through a process of dialogue and objective examination. It was unacceptable that the sponsors were using human rights issues to stigmatize particular States, as they lacked any moral authority. Her delegation called for an end to that practice.

53. **Mr. Srivali** (Thailand) said that his delegation would abstain from voting based on its long-held position that the advancement of human rights should be pursued through constructive engagement rather than through General Assembly resolutions. In addition, it should be noted that Myanmar had undergone the universal period review process, which was the most appropriate forum for discussing human rights situations in a non-discriminatory manner. His Government was encouraged by the steps taken by the Government of Myanmar towards national reconciliation, including the establishment of a human rights commission. Thailand had supported Myanmar's bid for Chairmanship of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in the hope that it would continue its momentum towards reform. As Myanmar's neighbour, Thailand also stood ready to lend its support bilaterally and within the ASEAN context.

54. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution based on its opposition to measures that selectively targeted Southern States. The universal period review process was the appropriate means for considering human rights situations, on the basis of dialogue and cooperation.

55. *At the request of the representative of Myanmar, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.55/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Zambia.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.3/L.55/Rev.1 was adopted by 98 votes to 25, with 63 abstentions.*

57. **Ms. Li** Xiaomei (China) said that her delegation regretted that some States had chosen to advance a draft resolution against Myanmar within the Third Committee. Cooperation and dialogue were the best way to address human rights situations. Through the positive measures that it had taken to promote national reconciliation, the Government of Myanmar had shown that such dialogue was possible. As a neighbouring State, her Government wished to see economic progress and stability in Myanmar.

58. **Mr. Khan** (Indonesia) said that his Government had been a supporter of the Secretary-General's good offices mission in Myanmar, both bilaterally and within ASEAN. His delegation was heartened to note that the new Myanmar Government had begun to implement the reform measures which it had outlined earlier that year, in particular the establishment of a human rights commission. The fact that Daw Aung San Suu Kyi had been allowed to engage in high-level dialogue was also a source of encouragement. While his delegation supported the united message contained in the draft resolution which called for further steps towards a democratic transition, it regretted that the main sponsor had missed opportunities to better reflect the positive progress made in Myanmar.

59. A more constructive approach would have recognized the enormity of the task of making a peaceful transition towards democracy. He recalled the Secretary-General's repeated calls for united support from the international community as the means to encourage the Government of Myanmar. The universal periodic review process provided a more realistic mechanism for assessing the human rights situation in all Member States. On the basis of those considerations, his delegation had abstained from voting.

60. **Mr. Abdullah** (Malaysia) said that his delegation welcomed the positive developments towards national reconciliation in Myanmar. The international community should enhance its engagement with the Government of Myanmar rather than exploiting human rights for political purposes. A non-confrontational approach must be adopted in all inter-State matters. His delegation had therefore abstained from voting. He urged Member States to take advantage of the universal periodic review process to address the human rights questions in given States. His Government looked forward to the reforms planned in Myanmar, which would transform it into a more prosperous neighbour, and urged the Government to cooperate with Secretary-General's good offices mission.

61. **Ms. Nguyen Cam Linh** (Viet Nam) said that, as a neighbouring State, her country had been closely following the developments in Myanmar. She commended the States that had urged the international community to support the national reconciliation process. It was hoped that the Government of Myanmar would maintain its momentum and achieve peace and prosperity. The inclusion by the sponsors of some positive elements within the draft resolution that year should be seen as an indication that cooperation was the only effective means to resolving the situation in Myanmar. Her delegation did not support the use of country-specific resolutions and had voted against the draft resolution.

62. **Mr. Ntwaagae** (Botswana) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution for a number of reasons. The commitments to reform set out by the President of Myanmar, the release of some political prisoners and the opening of a democratic process, were welcome signs that a credible and efficient system of government was under development. It was in the national interest of the Government to seize the opportunity to achieve durable peace and unity. Its re-engagement with the international community and the United Nations system was also an encouraging development.

63. However, his Government remained concerned about the remaining human rights issues in the country, as set out in the Secretary-General's reports, including armed conflicts among ethnic groups, the continued detention of political prisoners and concerns regarding the availability and accessibility of education and health care. He urged the Government to demonstrate its willingness to address those issues and offered his own Government's support in promoting and protecting of human rights.

64. **Mr. de Séllos** (Brazil) said that his Government welcomed the steps taken by Myanmar to promote human rights and advance the transition to democracy and encouraged increased efforts in that direction. The participation of Myanmar in the universal periodic review process earlier that year was also a particularly encouraging sign of renewed dialogue with the United Nations system. The international community should strengthen its cooperation with the Myanmar

authorities to support national reconciliation and ensure the enjoyment of human rights in the country.

65. However, many human rights issues remained to be addressed, including the situation of ethnic minorities and the detention of prisoners of conscience, which was a matter of particular concern to his Government. While the release of some detainees was a welcome development, there were discrepancies between sources in terms of the number of remaining prisoners. He urged the relevant parties to investigate and provide accurate numbers to prevent any misunderstandings. He also called on the Government to investigate the reports of sexual violence committed by members of the armed forces and offer reparation to the victims. His delegation took note that ASEAN had expressed optimism concerning the future of Myanmar and called on the proponents of the draft resolution to respond in a manner compatible with progress made when considering the human rights situation in a country.

66. **Mr. Kodama** (Japan) said that his delegation supported the international community's call for further measures to improve the human rights situation and promote democracy in Myanmar and had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution. It had proposed amendments acknowledging progress towards national reconciliation in order to balance the text and was pleased that they had been included. He welcomed the Government's amendment of the law on political parties and the restoration of the National League for Democracy, which would result in more fair and open elections. It was hoped that the Government would address the outstanding human rights issues, including by releasing the remaining political prisoners.

67. **Mr. Ang** Choo Pin (Singapore) said that his delegation disagreed with the adoption of country-specific draft resolutions as a matter of principle, as they were politically motivated and divisive. The universal periodic review process had been developed precisely to address human rights issues. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote and would take that position in any future votes on similar draft resolutions. His Government welcomed the positive changes that had taken place in Myanmar, which would help integrate the country into the global community.

68. **Mr. Swe** (Myanmar) said that his delegation had requested a vote pursuant to the principled stance of the Non-Aligned Movement against country-specific resolutions. The draft resolution had been introduced at a time when his Government was strengthening its cooperation with the international community. Reports issued by high-level United Nations officials had noted positive outcomes of their missions in Myanmar and had underscored the need for a constructive approach. The draft resolution only served to undermine trust between his Government and potential partners.

69. No State could claim a perfect human rights record; Member States should therefore oppose measures that embodied double standards in that regard. His Government disassociated itself from the draft resolution and would not be bound by its provisions. In line with its foreign policy, it would continue to cooperate with the good offices mission of the Secretary-General and the Human Rights Council with sincerity and good will. He thanked those delegations that had stood in solidarity with Myanmar, despite the pressure exerted on them.

70. **Ms. Horsington** (Australia) said that her delegation acknowledged the progress towards reform achieved by the Government of Myanmar, including new legislation on labour unions and greater freedom for the media. The draft resolution struck a balance between encouraging the positive trajectory and emphasizing the need to address remaining human rights concerns. Her Government stood ready to help the Government of Myanmar to follow through on its commitments to promoting democracy and national reconciliation and safeguarding human rights. The efforts of the Myanmar delegation to engage with the text were appreciated, and she hoped the Government would consider the draft resolution positively, as its message aimed to enhance the democratic process.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.56: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

71. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

72. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Andorra had joined the sponsors.

73. **Mr. Rishchynski** (Canada), speaking as the main sponsor, said that the decision to put forward a draft resolution on the Islamic Republic of Iran had not been taken lightly. The human rights situation on the ground had deteriorated since the Committee had discussed the issue the previous year. The Iranian Government's

persistent disregard for human rights and the egregious nature of its violations warranted the attention of the General Assembly. The Secretary-General's report on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran (A/66/361) had noted an intensification of human rights violations, and the situation had even led the Human Rights Council to appoint a Special Rapporteur to report on human rights conditions in the country. However, the Government had not permitted the Special Rapporteur to make a visit and carry out his mandate.

74. The sponsors had made an effort to accurately reflect in the text the developments over the past year. The draft resolution called on the Government to release those who had been arbitrarily detained and cooperate with the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. As the only body responsible for international human rights issues within the General Assembly, the Committee had an obligation to hold the Government accountable for the very serious human rights violations and provide a voice for the Iranian people. Lastly, he pointed out that in paragraph 2 (o) of the draft resolution, the phrase "subjected to torture and rape" had been revised to read, "subjected to torture, including rape".

75. **Ms. Medal** (Nicaragua) said that the promotion and protection of human rights were a pillar of her Government, which supported the international community's efforts to protect human rights around the world. Her delegation wished to reiterate the statement made by the representative of Cuba on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement concerning country-specific draft resolutions on human rights presented each year. The Human Rights Council was the appropriate body to address such issues, specifically through the universal periodic review mechanism, which was based on the principles of universality, objectivity and non-selectivity.

76. **Mr. Larijani** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that in the ninth consecutive year in which the United States of America, the European Union and Canada had advanced a draft resolution on the human rights situation in his country, it was more evident than ever that such a measure was procedurally unwarranted, substantially unfounded and intentionally malicious. The fact that the Human Rights Council had appointed a Special Rapporteur to evaluate the human rights situation in his country further justified a rejection of the draft resolution. The Special Rapporteur should be given time to prepare his reports without external pressure of prejudices in order for his mandate to be relevant. The Human Rights Council had been created precisely to prevent selectivity, and it should take full responsibility for pursuing human rights concerns worldwide.

77. His Government supported the principle of universality and had itself undergone the universal periodic review process the previous year. It had also defended its third periodic report on the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that year. His country had hosted the most visits from special procedures mandate holders of the Human Rights Council in the region and would be hosting the High Commissioner for Human Rights in the coming year. Such cooperation with United Nations mechanisms clearly constituted meaningful and genuine cooperation by his Government and provided solid grounds rejecting the draft resolution.

78. The universal periodic review process constituted the basis of his country's commitment to constructive cooperation, as it was an efficient and accountable mechanism which resulted in recommendations instead of accusations. However, the process of reporting on human rights within the United Nations system was misused. The reports of the Special Rapporteur and the Secretary-General on the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran were unprofessional, biased and near replicas of one another. The Committee should not allow such manipulation of the process by certain countries, which masked colonialist attitudes and arrogant attempts to dominate his country. The draft resolution consisted of over 150 shameful and baseless allegations and was an insult to the institution of the United Nations as a whole.

79. The States that were ostensibly champions of human rights were themselves not facing country-specific resolutions, although they were responsible for many documented human rights violations. For example, discrimination against immigrants was on the rise across Europe, the United States and Canada. No one could deny the increase in Islamophobia across the Western world, which had resulted in the violation of the basic rights of Muslims, while United States drones regularly killed innocent Afghan women and children.

80. The world was enthusiastically witnessing the historic toppling of notorious dictators across the

Middle East, many of whom had been strategic allies of the United States and other sponsors of the draft resolution and had enjoyed their support for decades. It was also revealing that the sponsors were mostly those who had ignored the Israeli regime's gross violation of the human rights of the Palestinian people. It was especially ironic that Israel, with its appalling record of war crimes, was among the sponsors.

81. The greatest achievement of the Islamic revolution in his country was the creation of a democratic social and political structure based on Islamic ideology, which had transformed it into a unique and major democracy in the Middle East, where positions of power were acquired and lost through the will of the people. For the West, his Government's greatest crime was having rejected secular liberal ideology with successful outcomes. Islamic rationality had made precious contributions to culture and social development, most recently inspiring the popular uprisings in the region, which were testimony of the failure of Western values and political dominance. In view of those considerations, he requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and urged the Committee to preserve the credibility of United Nations human rights mechanisms by voting against it.

82. **Mr. Rakhmetullin** (Kazakhstan), speaking on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), said that OIC was opposed to the use of country-specific resolutions, which selectively targeted developing and Islamic countries. OIC Member States were opposed to any initiative that could lead to the use of human rights as a means of exerting political pressure on developing countries. The draft resolution under consideration contradicted the spirit of cooperation. The Iranian Government had fully cooperated with the universal periodic review mechanism and, in 2010, had acceded to the Convention on the Rights of Person with Disabilities and signed the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict. OIC regretted that the draft resolution had been submitted despite the evidence of the Islamic Republic of Iran's cooperation with human rights mechanisms and the positive developments in the country. He urged all Member States to oppose the measure.

83. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation rejected the interference by any Member State in the internal affairs of another State under the guise of defending human rights. The Charter explicitly set out the principle of sovereign equality between all Member States. It appeared that some States were seeking to advance new guidelines that were not based on consensus or provided for in the Charter in order to exert political pressure. Cooperation for the protection of human rights in line with international law should be based on respect for national sovereignty and a country's cultural and religious specificities. He supported the Iranian delegation's view that human rights matters should be addressed within the Human Rights Council, not the Third Committee. Advancing such draft resolutions for well-known political motives threatened the legal credibility of the Committee in the context of international relations, undermined consensus on human rights matters, created double-standards and duplicated the work of more appropriate mechanisms.

84. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation once again firmly rejected the condemnation of particular States based on human rights issues. Country-specific draft resolutions were an illegitimate means of engaging in strategic confrontation. The States sponsoring the texts had committed human rights violations, but were not facing any such measures themselves. The Human Rights Council had created impartial mechanisms that did not single out developing countries. Her delegation would vote against the draft resolution and urged others to do the same.

85. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that the accusatory tactics employed in country-specific draft resolutions were the same as those that had discredited the former Commission on Human Rights. International cooperation based on the principles of objectivity and impartiality were the only means to achieving the effective promotion of human rights. The text under consideration was permeated by clear political motivations and her delegation would be voting against it.

86. *At the request of the Islamic Republic of Iran, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.56.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and

Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Vanuatu.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Paraguay, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia. Serbia, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Zambia.

87. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.56, as orally revised, was adopted by 86 votes to 32, with 59 abstentions.*

88. **Mr. de Séllos** (Brazil) said that his delegation regretted the fact that requests for visits to the Islamic Republic of Iran by special procedures mandate-holders had been outstanding since 2005 and encouraged the Iranian Government to receive the recently appointed Special Rapporteur. The restrictions on civil and political rights in the country were also a matter of concern. As an advocate for a universal ban on capital punishment, his delegation would have preferred inclusion of the issue in the draft resolution. He urged the Iranian Government to implement the recommendations resulting from the universal periodic review process and take measures to abolish juvenile executions and adopt a moratorium on the death penalty.

89. The reports of arbitrary detentions and discrimination against minorities, in particular members of the Baha'i faith, were another outstanding issue. His delegation believed that the draft resolution and the reports of United Nations officials should have provided a more balanced account of the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran and acknowledged positive steps taken in the areas of education, poverty eradication and women's participation in political institutions. It also remained convinced that the Human Rights Council was best equipped to examine human rights situations in a holistic, multilateral and non-selective manner.

90. **Mr. Larijani** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said he was grateful to those delegations that had supported his position. Those who believed that they could employ the United Nations as a theatre to flaunt their privileges would be defeated by the truth. Deliberations on human rights issues should be free from false accusations and vulgar insults. It was regretful that the representative of Brazil, a country with a serious record of prejudice and mistreatment of indigenous peoples, had spoken as if he knew the truth concerning the situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Without protection from such games, the objectives of the United Nations would not be achieved.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

United Nations A/C.3/66/SR.48

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session
Official Records

Distr.: General
7 February 2012
Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 48th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 21 November 2011, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Haniff ..... (Malaysia)

Contents

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 65: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

Agenda item 107: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

Agenda item 108: International drug control (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

11-60225 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.44/Rev.1, L.49/Rev.1, L.50/Rev.1 and L.51/Rev.1)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.56 and L.57/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.44/Rev.1: Promotion of the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

1. **Ms. Merchant** (Norway) said that Costa Rica and Thailand had joined the sponsors.

2. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Burkina Faso, Israel and the Niger had joined the sponsors.

3. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.49/Rev.1: National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights.

4. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

5. **Mr. Schroeer** (Germany), introducing the draft resolution, said that Costa Rica, India, Japan, Maldives, New Zealand and Thailand had joined the sponsors. The revised version of the draft resolution contained editorial changes to paragraphs 7, 10, 16 and 18.

6. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Lebanon, Mali, the Niger, Nigeria, Panama, the Russian Federation, South Sudan, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

7. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.49/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.50/Rev.1: International Day of the Girl

8. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

9. **Mr. Rishchynski** (Canada) speaking also on behalf of Peru and Turkey, said that the Bahamas, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Togo, the United States of America and Uruguay had joined the sponsors. Establishing an International Day of the Girl Child could raise awareness of the challenges that girls faced every day and provide opportunities for them to show leadership. The draft resolution and document A/C.3/66/L.24/Rev.1, entitled The girl child, were mutually reinforcing and complementary. A number of revisions had been made to the draft text. The title had been changed to "International Day of the Girl Child", which was also reflected in paragraphs 1 and 2. In addition, the third preambular paragraph had been replaced by the following text:

> "*Recognizing* that empowerment of and investment in girls, which are critical for economic growth, the achievement of all Millennium Development Goals, including the eradication of poverty and extreme poverty, as well as the meaningful participation of girls in decisions that affect them, are key in breaking the cycle of discrimination and violence and in promoting and protecting the full and effective enjoyment of their human rights, and further recognizing that empowering girls requires their active participation in decision making processes, active support and engagement of their parents, legal guardians, families and care providers, as well as boys and men, and the wider community;".

10. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, France, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Jordan Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Mauritius, Montenegro, the Netherlands, the Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis,

San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, South Sudan, Suriname, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

11. **Mr. von Haff** (Angola), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), said that, instead of including the draft resolution under agenda item 69 (b), it should have been included under agenda item 65, which dealt with the promotion and protection of the rights of children. Human rights was just one of the issues that needed to be addressed with regard to girls. Biennially, SADC tabled a resolution entitled "The girl child" under the agenda item on the promotion and protection of the rights of children. The draft resolution under consideration might erroneously be seen as a parallel process to that draft resolution.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.50/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.51/Rev.1: Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

13. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

14. **Mr. De Léon Huerta** (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution, said that Austria, Costa Rica, Egypt, France, Germany, Japan, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors. The approach taken in the draft resolution would complement the work of the Human Rights Council on the same topic.

15. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Angola, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Panama, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

16. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.51/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.56: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

17. **Ms. Ortigosa** (Uruguay) said that her delegation did not share the positions expressed by the Islamic Republic of Iran on the State of Israel and on whether or not the Holocaust was a matter of historical fact. Efforts to guarantee full human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran had fallen short. Her delegation radically disagreed with that country's refusal to cooperate with Argentine justice and with its use of the death penalty, in particular for minors, and execution by stoning.

18. Nonetheless, her country supported a human rights approach which stressed cooperation before proceeding to denunciation or confrontation. A dynamic which focused exclusively on denunciation or confrontation would be seriously limited. Uruguay had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution. While the invitation to the High Commissioner for Human Rights to visit the Islamic Republic of Iran was a step forward, the lengthy preparation time and delays were cause for concern. Visits by special procedures mandate holders should also be permitted.

19. **Mr. Kimura** (Japan) said that, while his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, the Government of Japan had held a human rights dialogue with the Islamic Republic of Iran earlier in the year, and appreciated the continuation of dialogue as indicative of a positive attitude. The Iranian Government should implement the 123 recommendations made as part of the universal periodic review, which it had accepted.

20. **Mr. Abdullah** (Malaysia) said that country-specific resolutions were susceptible to politicization and could detract attention from the objective of effecting positive change. His country strongly supported a non-confrontational approach, constructive and respectful dialogue and cooperation, with respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Islamic Republic of Iran had recently taken steps to demonstrate its engagement with the international community on human rights issues.

21. **Mr. Khan** (Indonesia) said that politicization was counterproductive and increased misunderstanding. The negotiations over the draft resolution had been highly politicized, resulting in a lack of meaningful dialogue and cooperation.

22. **Mr. Fiallo** (Ecuador) said that such draft resolutions were not motivated by human rights concerns. Pressure on nations of the South increased divisions among States. Country-specific resolutions had been used to justify intervention in sovereign States.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1: Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic

23. **Mr. Wittig** (Germany) said that Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Vanuatu had joined the sponsors.

24. Despite repeated calls from the international community, including the United Nations and the League of Arab States, widespread human rights violations continued in the Syrian Arab Republic. The death toll was mounting, with the most recent United Nations estimates stating that more than 3,500 civilians had been killed there. Syrian authorities had refused access to the independent international commission, although such access had been mandated by the Human Rights Council.

25. It was important to support the strong and remarkable stance taken by the League of Arab States and, in particular, its efforts to bring about an immediate end to the violence. The draft resolution was a unique response to the critical events currently taking place on the ground in the Syrian Arab Republic. The initiative had substantial support from States of the Arab League.

26. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the purpose of France, Germany and the United Kingdom in sponsoring the draft resolution was not to bolster human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic but rather to declare a political, media and diplomatic war on his country.

27. He doubted that the suffering of millions of civilians in his country owing to unilateral economic sanctions had contributed to the reinforcement of human rights. He also doubted that funding and arming opposition groups and hosting their leaders in conferences in the capital cities of some of the sponsors, at which there had been calls for armed rebellion and the overthrow of the Syrian Government, served the cause of human rights.

28. Some of the sponsors of the draft resolution had invaded and occupied other Member States, killing millions of their citizens. Heads of State and Ministers for Foreign Affairs of some of the sponsors had made public statements which had the effect of interfering in the internal affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic. Lies had been told at the United Nations regarding civilian casualty figures in his country. Many of the sponsors supported secret prisons and mounting human rights violations, including torture, in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya. France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America still had colonies and hundreds of military bases around the world.

29. The Western States that had sponsored the draft resolution turned a blind eye to the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, including the occupied Syrian Golan. They were silent regarding Israeli massacres of Arabs and the violation of the right to Palestinian self-determination. Threats by some countries to veto the Palestinian application for full membership in the United Nations did not bolster human rights.

30. Other actions by some of the sponsors that neither strengthened nor protected human rights included discrimination against Roma people in Germany and their eviction to Kosovo; the demolition of housing units in France and the eviction of thousands of Roma and related groups to Bulgaria and Romania; and encouragement and protection of Islamophobia. The ultimate goal of the sponsors was to put the United Nations out of existence, just as European nations had put the League of Nations out of existence in order to satisfy their colonial greed and their desire to plunder the wealth of the developing world.

31. Three of the European sponsors had caused bloody world wars resulting in the deaths of 100 million people. Millions of people had served as cannon fodder in those wars, including people from former colonies, the Syrian Arab Republic among them. Those European States oppressed their Arab Muslim citizens and guests, prevented them from constructing mosques and spread Islamophobia. Yet they spoke about human rights as if they were moral authorities. No European power had ever apologized

for the dark history of colonialism and slavery, nor had any country paid reparations to the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America for the crimes committed against them.

32. The draft resolution would more appropriately be entitled "The illness of animosity towards the Syrian Arab Republic." Those suffering from that illness should be referred to a specialized hospital for treatment rather than being permitted to engage in a futile quest to infect the rest of the Member States. Despite the negativity, the Syrian Arab Republic would continue to move ahead with its political and other reforms, which enjoyed a broad consensus in the country.

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.18/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.18/Rev.1: Violence against women migrant workers

33. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

34. **Ms. Werdaningtyas** (Indonesia), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of the Philippines, said that the Comoros, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti, Mali, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Senegal, Seychelles, Timor-Leste and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors. He pointed out a number of minor revisions to the text to reflect the language that had been agreed upon.

35. Globalization had created many employment opportunities outside of workers' countries of origin. There had been some 214 million international migrant workers in 2010, of whom 49 per cent had been women. While such employment opportunities could be empowering, they could also have adverse consequences. Women's vulnerability to inhuman treatment, violence and abuse in the workplace had numerous causes.

36. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Jamaica, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Mozambique, Namibia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

37. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.18/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

38. **The Chair**, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, suggested that the Committee should take note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women (A/66/215).

39. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.69/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.69/Rev.1: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

40. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

41. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Brazil, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Francia, Germany, Georgia, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America had joined the sponsors.

42. **Ms. Sulimani** (Sierra Leone), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that Spain had joined the sponsors. African countries and the international community were concerned about the increase in the number of refugees in Africa. While the refugee population in Africa had decreased slightly during 2010, that trend had been reversed in sub-Saharan Africa in 2011.

43. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.69/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 65: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.22/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.22/ Rev.1: Strengthening collaboration on child protection within the United Nations system

44. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

45. **Mr. Srivali** (Thailand), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, Belize, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, the Central African Republic, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Nepal, Nicaragua, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Senegal, the Sudan, Tajikistan and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

46. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Namibia, South Sudan and Swaziland had also joined the sponsors.

47. **Mr. Abdullah** (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), said that the member States of ASEAN firmly believed that the draft resolution was a milestone in seeking organizational improvement to protect children worldwide. Further strengthening collaboration within the United Nations was logical and necessary in light of new developments around the world. In 2010, in a historic step, ASEAN had established a Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children.

The meeting was suspended at 4:10 p.m. and resumed at 4:15 p.m.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.22/Rev.1 was adopted.*

49. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that his delegation was concerned that the draft resolution infringed on the prerogatives of other United Nations bodies and on the independence of mandate holders. With regard to paragraph 2, the United States reaffirmed its confidence in the relevant actors, rejecting any interpretation that indicated lack of confidence in them or that jeopardized the independence of their work.

50. The lead sponsors had provided assurances that the word "continue" in paragraph 2 related to both the phrase "to exercise their functions in a fully independent manner" as well as the phrase "to act in full observance of their respective mandates." That was the interpretation of the United States. The wording was, at best, infelicitous and, in future, should be replaced with a less ambiguous formulation.

51. The language in the sixth preambular paragraph reaffirming the role of the General Assembly in the United Nations child protection system ignored the important work of other United Nations bodies. The work of the General Assembly should not be given precedence over that of other United Nations bodies that were independent of the General Assembly. The United States applauded the important work of the relevant actors who made invaluable contributions to the well-being of children. Child protection was often broader than protection of the rights of the child.

52. Lastly, the report requested in paragraph 4 would duplicate other work and must not be interpreted to permit State interference in the work of the relevant actors. Independence and impartiality were the foundation of the work of the mandate holders for the rights of the child and child protection.

53. **Ms. Merchant** (Norway), speaking also on behalf of Liechtenstein and Switzerland, said that work on child protection was widely regarded as a United Nations success story. There was no need for the General Assembly to take any initiatives regarding information sharing among United Nations child rights actors. Such initiatives could challenge and undermine the independence of the relevant mandate holders. There was a concern that, as worded, the draft resolution could call into question whether the relevant United Nations actors had been observing their mandates. That was an inappropriate message to send.

54. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China) said that the draft resolution was positive and conducive to helping the relevant United Nations actors do a better job to strengthen compliance with child protection standards.

55. **Ms. Grabianowska** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that there were serious concerns regarding the text and aim of the draft resolution and that the added value of the text remained unclear. Great progress had been made in children's rights thanks to the United Nations actors.

56. It was important for all Member States to respect the work of all mandate holders and allow them to work independently without pressure or intimidation. The word "continue" in paragraph 2 was understood to refer to the rest of the sentence in its entirety. The report requested of the Secretary-General in paragraph 4 was not an evaluation mechanism but rather an opportunity to demonstrate effective collaboration among child protection actors.

57. **Ms. Murillo Ruin** (Costa Rica) said that the language of the draft resolution could not be interpreted in a way which was prejudicial to the position of the Secretary-General.

58. **Mr. Butt** (Pakistan) said that the language of the draft resolution was very appropriate and reflected the expectations of the general membership with regard to the relevant mandate holders. The controversy raised earlier had been completely unnecessary. All mandate holders must adhere fully to their mandates. That was what the Member States expected of them.

59. **Mr. Tagle** (Chile) said that the draft resolution in no way limited the independence of the mandate holders. Their impartiality was extremely important, and they would certainly continue along those lines.

Agenda item 107: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.15/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.15/Rev.1: Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity

60. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

61. **Mr. Mogini** (Italy) said that Dominica had joined the sponsors. Transnational organized crime jeopardized security, obstructed the functioning of public institutions, undermined respect for human rights and harmed legitimate economic activities. It operated as a global business which sought to reap big profits. Curbing its financial power would affect its raison d'être. Targeting huge illegal assets accumulated by criminals around the world must be a major thrust of international cooperation.

62. New elements of the draft resolution included asset recovery and a reference to the return of illicitly acquired assets to countries of origin, implementation of a global plan of action on human trafficking and launch of the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children.

63. New language focused on the efforts of the Secretary-General to develop an effective and comprehensive approach to transnational organized crime and drug trafficking; the need for a comprehensive and integrated approach to crime prevention and criminal justice reform at the national and regional levels; the need to strengthen the capacity of criminal justice systems to investigate and prosecute all forms of crime while protecting defendants' human rights and fundamental freedoms; and the successful outcome of the recent fourth session of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, held in Marrakesh.

64. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Andorra, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Ecuador, Kenya, Nicaragua, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Tunisia, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

65. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted.*

66. **Ms. Löw** (Switzerland) said that regrettably, delegations had been unable to agree on a direct reference to the task force on transnational organized crime and drug trafficking created earlier in the year at the initiative of the Secretary-General.

67. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had concerns regarding imprecise statements in the eleventh, fourteenth and sixteenth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution that were not substantiated by legal instruments in the area. Fighting transnational organized crime would not have an impact on international peace and security. Her country did not recognize systematic links between transnational organized crime, gun trafficking and terrorist activities. Each type of crime had different motivations, and automatically linking them violated norms of due process and the presumption of innocence. Such links should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

68. There was no generally accepted definition of terrorism, including State terrorism, so it was not possible to discuss shared responsibility in combating

terrorism. The sixteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution ran counter to the Bangkok Declaration on Synergies and Responses: Strategic Alliances in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice with regard to international cooperation in combating transnational crime. Moreover, terrorism should be addressed in the Sixth Committee.

69. **The Chair** suggested, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, that the Committee should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to the Twelfth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (A/66/91) and the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime on its fifth session (A/66/92).

70. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 108: International drug control (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.16/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.16/Rev.1: International cooperation against the world drug problem

71. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

72. **Mr. De Léon Huerta** (Mexico) said that Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, the Bahamas, Belize, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominica, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution had been updated by mentioning progress achieved during the past year in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

73. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Vanuatu and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

74. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted.*

75. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that efforts to reduce illicit drugs crops fell far short of the objectives set forth in the relevant international conventions. Illicit drug production had increased tremendously in recent years, which had had a major impact on transit countries. Her delegation had reservations with regard to paragraphs 18 and 19 of the draft resolution. It did not recognize systematic links between illicit drug trafficking and other types of transnational international crime, each of which had different motives and patterns. Such automatic linking ran counter to due process and the presumption of innocence. Cooperation should not be limited to technical and financial assistance and should be carried out with full respect for non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States and respect for sovereignty.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

United Nations A/C.3/66/SR.49

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
9 February 2012

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 49th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 22 November 2011, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Haniff ..... (Malaysia)

Contents

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

11-60366 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.11/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.11/Rev.1: Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Cesa** (Argentina), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, made the following oral amendments to the draft resolution. In the second to last line of the fourteenth preambular paragraph, the phrase "in particular, agricultural subsidies" should be deleted, and in paragraph 5, the word "crises" should be replaced by the word "prices".

3. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.11/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

4. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that the United States of America strongly supported the goals set forth in the draft resolution, and was committed to accelerating progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals, including Goal 1 on halving global hunger and poverty rates, by investing in country plans to boost agricultural development. Furthermore, his Government welcomed the attention given in the draft resolution to the rights of indigenous peoples, and echoed the call to promote respect of all human rights and fundamental freedoms in the context of development.

5. Nevertheless, his delegation reiterated its concern that a better balance had not been struck in the analysis of the relative impact of external and internal factors on social development. The draft resolution also mischaracterized the current state of financial markets and food security issues. The international community had long acknowledged that the primary responsibility for social and economic development rested with national Governments. While external economic factors could certainly affect a country's development, it mattered more whether national domestic policies responded to the aspirations of ordinary citizens, provided them opportunities, removed obstacles to broad-based economic growth and addressed their needs. In the case of food security, solutions must not only focus on external threats such as natural disasters and trade distortion but also on domestic food security issues such as lack of a domestic environment that enabled investment in agriculture. The draft resolution continued to overlook the need to retool domestic policies to foster agricultural growth. Moreover, the references in the text to food security and current financial and economic issues were at odds with the views of United Nations experts and many other members of the world community, who agreed that the world was not going currently going through a food crisis.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1: Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic

6. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

7. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the main sponsors had requested that the following corrections should be made to the draft resolution to reflect the text as submitted to the Secretariat. In the second line of the third preambular paragraph, the words "Human Rights" should be added before the words "Council resolution S-17/1 of 23 August 2011". In the same paragraph, the phrase "in which the Council decided to dispatch urgently" should be replaced with the phrase "which established an independent international commission of inquiry". In the second line of the fourth preambular paragraph, the words "of Arab States" should be added; the text would read "the steps undertaken by the League of Arab States." He announced that Kuwait had joined the sponsors.

8. **Mr. Lyall Grant** (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that the sponsors had proposed the draft resolution in response to the ongoing and widespread violence and human rights violations that had persisted in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011. Despite repeated calls from the international community, the violence continued, with the latest United Nations report estimating that well over 3,500 civilians had been killed to date. The Syrian authorities had refused to allow a United Nations-mandated commission of

inquiry access and had failed to implement the plan of action agreed on with the League of Arab States. Under those circumstances, the international community could not remain silent. The cross-regional draft resolution, an initiative intended to respond to critical events, called for the full implementation of the plan of action in its entirety and without delay. It did not aim at creating any new mechanisms or procedures, but to send a strong signal that ongoing violations and violence must come to an end.

9. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, reiterated its firm position, expressed at various high-level meetings, against the continued selectivity, politicization and double standards reflected in country-specific resolutions, which targeted developing countries that were also members of the Movement. The alarming increase in the adoption of such resolutions by the General Assembly constituted a clear exploitation by certain States of the question of human rights merely for political ends and had a negative impact on the credibility of United Nations efforts to promote and protect human rights, which should be governed by the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity. The Human Rights Council, and in particular, the universal periodic review, constituted the appropriate mechanisms for considering human rights situations in all countries, based on constructive dialogue. The Member States of the Non-Aligned Movement would therefore vote against the draft resolution and called on all other delegations to do so as well.

10. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, moved for the adjournment of the debate on the draft resolution, based on the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Country-specific situations must be considered in the context of the Human Rights Council's universal periodic review — which his country had recently undergone — not in the Committee. His Government's acceptance of a high percentage of recommendations reflected its commitment to promoting and protecting human rights at the national level.

11. Recalling his country's thousands of years of history, its role in the birth and development of the three monotheistic faiths and its steadfast opposition to foreign interference in the affairs of sovereign States, he noted that the Syrian Arab Republic had voted in favour of granting independence to tens of former colonies under Western rule — countries that were represented in the United Nations as equals alongside their former colonizers. His country had never withheld assistance to those seeking it, while others had shied away from doing so out of cowardice, only heeding limited political calculations.

12. Like any Member State, his country had some problems, and reform was indeed called for in several areas of political, economic and social life. Nevertheless, such reforms would not come in the form of suspiciously political draft resolutions sponsored by certain Member States in order to blackmail others, using the United Nations as a platform, nor by conducting a media, political and diplomatic war against the Syrian Arab Republic, or interfering in its internal affairs. The best way to help the reform process was for those States sponsoring the draft resolution to halt their media campaigns against his country, and to encourage armed opposition groups to renounce violence and participate in the mechanisms established to facilitate an inclusive national dialogue.

13. Unfortunately, every year a small number of countries hijacked the work of the Committee to force through their political objectives, which hindered the Committee from achieving the goals set out in its work on human rights. Some States sponsoring the draft resolution were part of the reason violence continued and was escalating in his country, as they were fomenting sectarian strife and pushing the country to the brink of civil war. He therefore wondered how those States could call for the protection of human rights of Syrian civilians, even as they were imposing economic and financial sanctions against the Syrian people, threatening to interrupt electricity and water supply, and hosting in their capitals meetings of armed Syrian opposition groups. Those groups had been allowed to issue declarations publicly from their land and claim responsibility for armed terrorist operations against Government objectives and interests inside the country.

14. The previous week, 90 people had been killed in Syria in a single day; his Government was only now making public the fact that 79 of them came from the ranks of the armed forces. His Government was deeply saddened by all the deaths and held those persons stoking the flames of strife fully responsible. Yet his delegation had not seen the same enthusiasm on the part of the sponsors of the draft resolution for pressuring Israel, the occupying Power, to end its

occupation of Arab territories, establishment of settlements, and to establish a Palestinian State. The double standard attested to political hypocrisy, moral deficit and short-sightedness. Thousands of resolutions and tens of fact-finding missions had come out of the United Nations, all to no avail. The only part of any resolution on the Arab-Israeli conflict that had been implemented by Israel and its protectors was half of the resolution on the partition of Palestine, while the other half, regarding the establishment of a Palestinian State in Palestine itself, had been forgotten.

15. His delegation called on Member States to realize the danger of accusing States of committing human rights violations, thus politicizing of the work of the Committee and deviating from pursuit of the noble goals and principles of human rights. He urged Member States to search their consciences and show their respect for human rights by upholding the truth, namely, that his country merely strove to preserve its sovereignty and bring about improvements in society by undertaking Government-planned reforms that had the endorsement and trust of the Syrian people. He took pride in the fact that the Syrian Arab Republic had achieved full independence and would not allow colonial powers, past or present, to interfere in its internal affairs again. For all those reasons, he urged all delegations to vote in favour of the motion.

16. **The Chair** said that, under rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, he would give the floor to two delegations in favour of the motion to adjourn debate and two delegations that opposed it, following which the motion would be immediately put to the vote.

17. **Ms. Medal** (Nicaragua), speaking in favour of the motion to adjourn consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1, expressed concern over the increase in country-specific resolutions, which, rather than promoting human rights, reflected selectivity, politicization and double standards. Countries that were genuinely concerned with the human rights situations of others should first evaluate their own situations and, if after doing so, they still felt morally entitled to criticize others, they should proceed in a spirit of respect and collaboration. While the Human Rights Council remained the ideal tool for the consideration of human rights issues, country-specific resolutions adopted in the General Assembly had proven ineffective and exacerbated adversarial relations between Member States. Moreover, such resolutions only targeted developing countries and never their developed counterparts, despite the massive human rights violations they committed. For that reason, Nicaragua supported the no-action motion and called on all countries, developing and developed alike, to vote in favour of it, in the interest of non-interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign States and collaboration on promoting and protecting human rights marked by mutual respect. Developed countries had the opportunity to contribute to the promotion of human rights by meeting their official development assistance commitments, as extreme poverty inhibited the effective exercise of all human rights.

18. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her country had a traditional principled position against country-specific resolutions, which accused countries selectively and on the basis of political motivations that had nothing to do with the defence of human rights. The establishment of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review mechanism had made it possible to consider human rights situations in all countries in a just, balanced and constructive manner. Therefore, her delegation believed that consideration of the draft resolution in the General Assembly was unjustified and must be removed from the Committee's agenda immediately, being as it violated the principles of respectful dialogue, international cooperation and impartiality that must govern approaches to human rights issues. The type of action being proposed constituted a tool used by imperialist powers to defend purely political interests. It was ironic that the imperialists of the day proclaimed themselves sacrosanct defenders of human rights, for the reality exposed their double standards. She therefore called on all States to vote in favour of the no-action motion, regardless of their position on the draft resolution.

19. **Mr. Al-Mouallimi** (Saudi Arabia) said that the situation in the sister nation of the Syrian Arab Republic had reached a critical juncture and could not be ignored. His Government had called on the Syrian authorities to put an end to the violence and begin a comprehensive dialogue and genuine reform. Saudi Arabia had worked with other Arab countries to put in place a comprehensive plan of action to resolve the Syrian crisis, preserve Syria's security and safety, protect its sovereignty and spare it the dangers of foreign intervention. The Syrian Government had

initially agreed to the plan but had then reverted to obstructing its implementation.

20. His delegation fully grasped the great role that Syria had played throughout its long and distinguished history and appreciated the sacrifices made by the Syrian people and its support for peoples struggling to liberate themselves. For that reason, voting to adjourn the debate on the draft resolution would send the message to the Syrian people that the international community valued neither their suffering nor the blood spilled by their children, a message unworthy of the United Nations and its Member States. The draft resolution was not country-specific but rather dealt with a unique situation that his delegation hoped would not recur. Saudi Arabia therefore called on Member States to vote against the motion to adjourn the debate so that the international community's honest opinion on the draft resolution might be voiced, particularly since it affirmed the Arab Initiative of the League of Arab States. The Initiative focused on the need to end the cycle of violence in Syria, whatever its source, to protect human rights and to preserve Syrian unity and sovereignty, avoiding foreign intervention in its internal affairs.

21. **Mr. Araud** (France) said that the draft resolution was not a country-specific resolution but rather a unique initiative justified by the urgency of the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, which continued to deteriorate, with that country rejecting the peace plan proposed by the League of Arab States and the number of victims steadily rising. A vote to adjourn the debate on the draft resolution would be tantamount to denying the urgency and the need for the draft resolution, which had the support of various countries in the region. The short text called for an end to violence and support for the initiative of the League of Arab States. His country would therefore vote against the motion so as to reject the attempt to end the debate on such a crucial question.

22. *A recorded vote was taken on the motion for the adjournment of debate concerning draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Latvia, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Guyana, India, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

23. *The motion was rejected by 118 votes to 20, with 29 abstentions.*

24. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that one of his colleagues — whose delegation he would

not refer to by name out of respect for their shared Arab traditions — had called on all armed parties in the Syrian Arab Republic to stop the violence. While his Government would endorse that stance, the draft resolution being considered was devoid of any comparable political balance and took a hostile position on the issue of stability in the country. Moreover, the country from which his colleague hailed was hosting a Salafi satellite television network that was working without interruption to foment sectarian strife among Syrians.

25. First and foremost, his delegation questioned the allusion to the Charter of the United Nations in the draft resolution, given that the sponsors had effectively violated the sanctity of the Charter by disregarding the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. It was also surprising that the sponsors were inviting the Syrian authorities to implement the plan of action of the League of Arab States on the situation in his country, when his country had already signed the document and welcomed the committee in charge of following up the initiative. His Government had also accepted the draft protocol adopted by the ministerial meeting of the League, which called for sending a mission to verify the implementation of the plan of action and to evaluate the situation in his country firsthand, away from the media disinformation campaigns. However, the draft resolution neglected to mention the armed groups that jeopardized the security of citizens and property, something any sovereign State would categorically refuse to accept. It was ironic that some of the sponsors accused those resisting foreign occupation in Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine, the occupied Syrian Golan and elsewhere of terrorism, and insisted that no terrorist groups were active in Syria, even as the heads of those groups had made public declarations and confessions of their deeds. Those States refused to recognize the existence of armed groups because it was they who were responsible for arming, financing and protecting them.

26. It was no secret that the United States of America was the chief instigator and mastermind of the political campaign against his country. Ultimately, the draft resolution had nothing to do with human rights and was simply part of its hostile policy towards the Syrian Arab Republic.

27. His delegation had transmitted to the Secretary-General, the President of the Security Council and the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee a detailed letter identifying the persons responsible for smuggling weapons into the Syrian Arab Republic from neighbouring countries, their crimes, the types of weapons smuggled and the number of persons killed. In addition to that document (S/2011/707), his delegation was reporting to the Secretary-General and to the Security Council on the steps taken towards reform, including the release of thousands of detainees not guilty of shedding blood and the establishment of national commissions of enquiry into some of the abuses that occurred against civilians. Nevertheless, the draft resolution regrettably omitted all information provided by his Government and instead took a selective and blatantly deceptive approach. The sponsors of the draft resolution had a poor record in the area of human rights; European countries and the United States of America continued to invade and impose unilateral economic sanctions on developing countries, thus depriving them of their rights to live in peace and security and to development. Against that backdrop, he wondered how the sponsors could defend human rights given their own fundamental failure to protect the human rights of women, foreigners, religious minorities and other groups.

28. The United States of America, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Germany, Canada and the European countries sponsoring the draft resolution had punished and were still punishing the Palestinian people for exercising their choice in a democratic electoral process, and were complicit in crimes against humanity through their silence on and support of Israeli occupation of Arab territories and massacres of Arab peoples. However, some sponsors were not aware that they were helping the plans of others by drawing attention away from the Israeli occupation and preventing the establishment of a Palestinian State. The threat of the United States and some European countries to cut off aid to Palestinians if they submitted their legitimate request for full membership in the United Nations attested to the ill will of the sponsors towards his country and their desire to pressure it into changing its strategic political choices, and exposed the aim of the resolution as a patently political one. His delegation therefore called on Member States with a conscience to support both the Syrian State and people, acknowledge its right to make its own democratic choices, and reject any foreign interference in its internal affairs. He invited those countries to put a stop to the plot, the existence of which was becoming more apparent with every

irresponsible statement made by the foreign ministers of several of the States sponsoring the draft resolution.

29. The promotion by some sponsors of the demands of the radical Syrian opposition, namely, overthrow of the regime by force, was a coup attempt supported from abroad, not a reform process; the United Nations must never support such a project. In that connection, he wondered whether the statements by some leaders and foreign ministers of States Members of the United Nations calling for the ouster of the Syrian president might be considered a flagrant violation of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations, not to mention a gross interference in Syrian internal affairs and incitement of the Syrian street against the legitimate leadership and national dialogue. The "Arab Spring" was merely a reformulation of the Sykes-Picot colonial convention to build the so-called "New Middle East", an entity led by Israel and intended to replace what was known as the Arab nation, based on the fragmentation of the region's countries along sectarian, ethnic and religious lines. That transformation would pave the way for a new ethnic cleansing against the Palestinians in their homeland and prevent the establishment of an independent Palestinian State.

30. The draft resolution and the ridiculous plots and manoeuvres against his country would not deter it from moving forward on reform and protecting the Syrian people from foreign interference and ambitions. The Syrian Arab Republic was determined to uphold and promote the human rights and fundamental freedoms of its people and to continue its role in enhancing international cooperation on human rights issues. In light of the above, he requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and hoped that all Member States would oppose it.

31. **Mr. Al Habib** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and Organization of Islamic Cooperation, his Government opposed country-specific resolutions in the Committee. Country-specific situations should be addressed through the appropriate United Nations mechanisms, including the universal periodic review — a process in which the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic had cooperated.

32. The Committee's undertaking of country-specific resolutions led it down the same path of politicization as the now-defunct Human Rights Commission, hindering the promotion and protection of human rights. It was only through cooperation and dialogue, in a way that ensured equality and the sovereign rights of States, rather than through pressure and mischievous intentions, that those rights could be ensured. His delegation would thus vote against the draft resolution.

33. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her Government rejected the selective singling out of countries under the pretext of defending human rights. Country-specific resolutions were being used to fulfil political agendas and satisfy neo-colonial desires for the market domination of other countries' resources. Some powers were using the noble principles of human rights for the sole purpose of geopolitical domination. Transparency and cooperation were key to ensuring the promotion and protection of human rights. In that respect, her Government applauded the efforts made by the Syrian Arab Republic to engage in dialogue with the opposition. Outside interference was regrettable; the matter under consideration fell under the purview of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review, not the Committee. Cooperation, impartiality, respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty must underpin any action undertaken for the promotion and protection of human rights. Diplomacy should be used for peace, not war. Venezuela would thus be voting against the draft resolution, and urged all delegations to do the same.

34. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that her country rejected country-specific resolutions because they were politically-motivated and unrelated to human rights. It was that very harmful and selective practice of double standards on human rights issues which had led to the dissolution of the Human Rights Commission. The universal periodic review was the mechanism for examining countries' human rights situations on equal footing and through constructive dialogue. International cooperation based on the principles of objectivity, non-conditionality and non-selectivity was the only way to protect human rights. Unfortunately, that was not the purpose of the draft resolution, which reflected clear political motivations. Cuba would thus be voting against it.

35. **Mr. Kim** Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his Government rejected the draft resolution and was deeply concerned about the continuing practice of selectivity and country-specific

resolutions. It was with objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity that human rights should be considered, and in the framework of the universal periodic review, on equal footing. Such country-specific resolutions were politically motivated and used human rights as a pretext when the true aim was to pressure the developing countries they targeted, including his own country. That approach was regrettable and must be stopped. His delegation strongly opposed the draft resolution and would be voting against it.

36. *At the request of the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Congo, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, India, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

37. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/57/Rev.1 was adopted by 122 votes to 13, with 41 abstentions.*

38. **Mr. Tsymbaliuk** (Ukraine) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, on the understanding that in paragraph two, the call for an immediate end to all violence in the Syrian Arab Republic referred to all parties involved in the confrontation.

39. **Mr. Wang** Min (China) said that his delegation had always maintained that human rights matters were best addressed through constructive dialogue and cooperation rather than through pressure and country-specific resolutions. His Government called on the Syrian Arab Republic to put an end to the violence and establish order through a balanced process. It endorsed the Plan of action of the League of Arab States. For those reasons, China had voted in favour of the no-action motion and had abstained on the draft resolution.

40. **Mr. Bui** The Giang (Viet Nam) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because his Government did not support country-specific resolutions. At the same time, it was concerned about the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic and called on all parties there to put an end to the violence and conflict, and engage in constructive and peaceful dialogue.

41. **Mr. Abdullah** (Malaysia) said that his delegation had abstained from the vote. It took note that the Syrian Arab Republic had taken steps to engage with the international community, including through its participation in the universal periodic review process.

Malaysia firmly believed in adopting a non-confrontational approach on all matters, including human rights, and in respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity. Human rights should not be politicized, including through the selective targeting of countries. The Government of the Syrian Arabic Republic had a positive role to play in the process, and the best approach the international community could take was to engage in cooperative and constructive dialogue.

42. **Mr. Prosor** (Israel) said that his Government supported the draft resolution. The Syrian delegation's attacks on his country were an attempt to divert attention away from the matter at hand, which was of serious concern. Israel stood ready to engage with other countries in the Middle East to promote peace, stability and freedom.

43. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as an expression of Egypt's support, based on its own revolution of 25 January 2011, for the demands by the Syrian people for fundamental reforms that would enable them to live in freedom, dignity and democracy, to achieve better living standards and to ensure the full respect of the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms. Moreover, the text of the draft resolution had been made more consistent with the position adopted by the Council of the League of Arab States at the Foreign Minister level at its two meetings on 12 and 16 November 2011. The draft was thus based on the full and immediate implementation of the Plan of Action of the League of Arab States, calling, inter alia, for the immediate cessation of military actions and the dispatch of an observer mission to the Syrian Arab Republic. It was also based on ensuring the honest implementation of Human Rights Council resolutions S-16/1 of 29 April and S-17/1 of 22 August, including for guaranteeing cooperation of the Syrian authorities with the independent fact-finding mission.

44. Lastly, the draft resolution helped preserve the unity and territorial integrity of the Syrian Arab Republic and could not be interpreted as an invitation for foreign intervention. That was made clear in the recently added eighth preambular paragraph which stated that all States Members of the United Nations should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State or act in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations — a clear assertion of the importance of reaching a comprehensive political settlement on the deteriorating situation in the country.

45. **Mr. Karev** (Russian Federation) said that his country had consistently opposed unilateral country-specific resolutions as they did not help to resolve human rights situations. States themselves had the primary responsibility of ensuring the protection and promotion of human rights while it fell to the international community to provide them with technical assistance. It was such assistance, and not mentoring, that the Syrian Arab Republic needed more than ever. The violence in that country must be ended and national dialogue on democratic processes stepped up. Nevertheless, the Syrian authorities' efforts to improve the situation in the country should not be overlooked, and they should be given the opportunity to resolve the situation for themselves. It was thus inadmissible to use force or intervention in the Syrian Arab Republic. The human rights situation in any country could be a source of concern for the international community. However, those issues should not be used as a pretext for interference in State affairs. His delegation had thus abstained from the vote.

46. **Mr. Srivali** (Singapore) said that his Government maintained a position of principle against country-specific resolutions. Nevertheless, its abstention from the vote should not be interpreted as its taking a position on the human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, or as condoning the mistreatment of citizens. He called on all States to promote and protect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all citizens.

47. **Ms. Andamo** (Thailand) said that her Government had serious concerns about the violence that was occurring in the Syrian Arab Republic and hoped that stability and a long-term solution could be found, and that the recommendations from the universal periodic review could be implemented as soon as possible. Thailand had abstained in the vote on the basis of its opposition to country-specific resolutions and because the Human Rights Council and universal periodic review were the most appropriate mechanisms for addressing the matter.

48. **Mr. Ulibarri** (Costa Rica) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of its concern over the grave human rights violations in the Syrian Arab Republic, and maintained its

principled position of voting against any no-action motion, as that mechanism impeded the international community's ability to consider matters of interest to Member States. The Human Rights Council was the competent body for addressing the situation and must be given a prominent role in that regard. It had the tools needed to examine specific cases of concern. His delegation had thus not been a sponsor of the draft resolution. It supported the universal periodic review, which was the appropriate mechanism for the regular review of country situations and could strengthen the Human Rights Council as the highest authority within the United Nations for promoting and protecting human rights throughout the world. Nevertheless, the international community had a responsibility to denounce systematic abuse or violations of human rights anywhere in the world as they occurred, and if necessary, to address them specifically.

49. **Mr. Fiallo** (Ecuador) said that the Committee was not the appropriate forum for addressing country-specific situations, which were best left to the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review mechanism. Therefore his Government had supported the no-action motion and endorsed the statement made on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Ecuador adhered to universality, impartiality and non-selectivity in considering human rights matters and believed that specific countries should not be targeted. All States must refrain from threatening territorial integrity and from politicization. Only dialogue would enable effective resolution. For those reasons, Ecuador had voted against the draft resolution.

50. **The Chair** suggested that before concluding the consideration of agenda item 69 as a whole, the Committee should, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, take note of the following documents: Report of the Human Rights Committee (A/66/40); Report of the Committee against Torture (A/66/44); Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Voluntary Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery (A/66/217); Report of the Secretary-General on measures to improve further the effectiveness, harmonization and reform of the treaty body system (A/66/344); Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture (A/66/276); Note by the Secretary-General submitting the report of the Chairs for the human rights treaty bodies on their twenty-third meeting (A/66/175); Note by the Secretary-General on the Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (A/66/259); Report of the Secretary-General on the draft programme of activities for the International Year for People of African Descent (A/66/342); Report of the Secretary-General on the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (A/66/284); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons (A/66/285); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions (A/66/330); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the interim report of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers (A/66/289); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children (A/66/283); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the interim report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health (A/66/254); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the independent expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights (A/66/271); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living and on the right to non-discrimination in this context (A/66/270); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the interim report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education (A/66/269); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights (A/66/265); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression (A/66/290); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 (A/66/358); Reports of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the international independent commission of inquiry on the situation of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire (A/66/518); Report of

the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/66/36).

51. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.10/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.10/Rev.1: High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Realization of the Millennium Development Goals and Other Internationally Agreed Development Goals for Persons with Disabilities

52. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee), making a statement, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, on the programme budget implications of paragraphs 2, 3(a) and 4 of the draft resolution, said that, with regard to paragraphs 2 and 3(a), it was envisaged that the high-level meeting would comprise one opening plenary meeting from 10:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., followed by an informal interactive round table until 1 p.m., and another interactive round table from 3 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. followed by a short closing plenary until 6 p.m. on 23 September 2013. That comprised two meetings in total, requiring interpretation services in all six official languages and verbatim record service for the plenary meetings only. The requirements for those and related support services would be covered by the budgetary provisions provided to service the General Assembly on the understanding that there would be no parallel meetings of the General Assembly or its Working Groups.

53. As for paragraph 4, it was estimated that additional requirements of $100,100 would arise to process two documents with a total estimated 17,000 words into all six languages. The Secretary-General would make every effort to absorb the costs within the provision in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013, through more efficient use of resources available.

54. Regarding the wording "within existing resources" in paragraphs 2 and 4, attention was drawn to the provisions of section IV of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990 and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which was resolution 64/243 of 24 December 2009.

55. Therefore, should the draft resolution be adopted by the General Assembly, no additional programme budget implications would arise for the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

56. **Ms. Maduhu** (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking also on behalf of the Philippines, said that Argentina, Cameroon, Canada, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Iceland, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Namibia, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Qatar, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, the United States of America, Viet Nam and Zambia had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

57. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Benin, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Chad, the Comoros, Guinea, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Maldives, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine and Zimbabwe had also joined the sponsors.

58. **Ms. Grabianowska** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union was committed to the main objective of the draft resolution and hoped that the agreed modalities could lead to substantive discussion and push forward the agenda of persons with disabilities. It had been disappointing that, in the discussion on modalities, some States had expressed a reluctance to ensure the full participation of civil society at the high-level meeting, whereas maintaining a strong and open dialogue with civil society groups within the rules of procedure of the General Assembly would be important for the high-level discussion. The European Union had consistently maintained that the process of admission of non-governmental organizations to participate in the high-level meeting should be transparent and allow for their full involvement. It interpreted paragraph 7 to mean that, within the Assembly, Member States would be able to challenge objections by other States to the presence of civil society representatives or particular non-governmental organizations. That was one reason it had been unable to sponsor the draft resolution. Member States should adopt a more constructive approach in future discussions on civil society participation at the United Nations.

59. **Ms. Hernando** (Philippines), speaking also on behalf of Tanzania and the other co-sponsors, said that the sponsors had endeavoured to draft a balanced text that would enjoy the broadest possible support.

60. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted.*

61. **The Chair** suggested that before concluding the consideration of agenda item 27 as a whole, the Committee should, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, take note of the Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (A/66/124), and the Report of the Secretary-General on the world social situation 2011: the global social crisis (A/66/226).

62. *It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.